

Great progress has been made in the past year in the development of an artificial heart and the related appliances which hold the promise for normal life expectancy for additional thousands of people each year. I am deeply proud of the stimulus given this program by increased funds recommended by our subcommittee in the past 2 years.

In another and equally important field, the Congress has accepted the recommendation of our committee stepping up the pace of the Nation's effort to improve and make more widely available machines to extend the lives of people whose kidney function has been impaired or lost. Funds made available for this program will hasten the day when enough machines will be available so that all who suffer from kidney failure may benefit from this treatment, instead of some being kept alive and others being denied the right to live simply because enough artificial kidneys are not available, as is the situation now. Our committee has been in the forefront in kidney research for years and we are pleased with the results so far.

There is no doubt of our progress toward the control of killing diseases and premature death. It is not unreasonable for us to be concerned about improving the quality of life in the added years promised by our success against the major killing and crippling diseases. I am therefore especially pleased that this Congress passed into law a bill which I introduced—the Older Americans Act. This legislation provides the first real framework—including establishment of the Office of Aging Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Remarkable as these accomplishments and new programs are, they do not mark an end to our dealings with social and health problems. Rather, they have opened new doors, have blazed new paths, which will challenge future Congresses to major expansion and improvement.

Such further development is already foreshadowed in bills that have been introduced late in the 89th Congress and which—if they do not pass this session—will emerge as major bills in sessions to come.

One of these is my bill to assist the establishment and operation of regional and community adult health protection centers. These centers would specialize in the early diagnosis of the chronic diseases of older Americans. In the area of chronic disease it has become axiomatic that early detection assures the best chance of curing or arresting the disease.

This bill would enable the proven swiftness and accuracy of computerized diagnosis to be brought to regional centers across the country. Use of automatic, semiautomatic techniques of diagnosis by a qualified medical specialist or technician aids significantly in obtaining an accurate and comprehensive diagnosis, at the same time dealing, to a considerable extent, with the problem of scarcity of professional health personnel.

At the health protection centers, tests would be made to check for the early stages of heart disease, cancer, deafness, arthritis, rheumatism, kidney disease, glaucoma, and other chronic disorders. These services would be made available to any person over age 50 who resides in a geographic area served by one of the centers.

The adult health protection centers are not intended to replace full examinations but to place in the hands of the examining physician a summary of basic health data. Any person found with indications of disease would be urged to seek the advice of a physician of his choice.

Training in the operation of the technical disease detection procedures and research into new methods of diagnosis is also among the provisions of this bill.

Another bill which I have introduced would increase benefits under the social security system and make other needed improvements in the system.

Even at the upper levels the present system of benefits is barely sufficient to provide subsistence in most parts of the country. Because of age, disability, or being a widow or an orphan, more than 1 out of every 10 Americans depends on social security for their economic well-being.

Among the important provisions of the bill are an average of a 50-percent increase in cash benefits; setting the earn-

ings base at a higher and more realistic level so that workers at average and above-average earning levels will receive social security benefits in retirement that compare reasonably with their accustomed levels of living; keeping benefits up to date with economic conditions once people start getting their benefits; automatic adjustments of the contributions and benefit base to increases in earning levels; health insurance protection to persons at any age who receive disability benefits; other improvements in the provision for determining realistic benefits for elderly and disabled persons.

A third bill I have introduced would extend and improve the Federal-State program of child welfare services under the Social Security Act. Under the provisions of this bill the Federal Government would be able to provide an expanded program to assist State public welfare agencies in meeting the costs of child welfare services—including the crushing costs of foster care—and to provide special project grants for developing new and necessary child welfare resources.

Finally, I have introduced two other bills aimed at meeting our great needs in the field of health education. One would amend the National Defense Education Act to strengthen instruction in health education and to provide for training institutes for personnel engaged in health education. The other would amend the Public Health Service Act to make school health educators eligible for traineeships under its provisions.

These as well as other measures yet to be introduced by me and other of my colleagues both in the House and the Senate will spur succeeding Congresses to carry on in the great tradition of the 89th.

Mr. Speaker, whether or not these Congresses will equal or surpass the number of important accomplishments of the last 2 years is immaterial. What is important is whether our successors, who will in many instances be ourselves, will be able to match the noble vision of the 89th Congress and its unshakable determination to make America a safer, happier, and healthier place in which to live.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good: for His mercy endureth forever.—Psalm 107: 1.

Eternal God, our Father, who are the source of wisdom and beauty and goodness, whose spirit ever seeks to arise within our hearts and in the hearts of men everywhere—make Thyself known to us as we bow in prayer before Thee. We thank Thee that Thou art everywhere—that no condition and no distance can ever separate us from Thee and from Thy love. We thank Thee that Thy mercies never fail and Thy loving kindness never ceases. We are grateful

for our lives which are in Thy hands and for Thy continuous goodness which blesses us all our days. Help us to be worthy of Thy gifts and to use them for Thy glory and for the welfare of our Nation and of our world. Grant that each one of us may do our part to bring about, on these shores, an order of society in which there will be no injustice, no bitterness of spirit, and one in which each person may come to the fullness of life for which he was made, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2287. An act to authorize a 5-year hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3553. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Brooks.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana as to the program for today and the rest of the week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the distinguished minority leader, today we hope to finish the Public Works Appropriations Act, which will be called up immediately. After we dispose of that bill, we hope to finish the Reserve bill, which is on the calendar for today. On tomorrow we will call up the Chamizal Memorial Highway bill and we plan to add two bills to the program for tomorrow: first, H.R. 13825, to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of an international flood control project for the Tijuana River in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes, and H.R. 12047, to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Louisiana tell the Members from what committee does the former bill come?

Mr. BOGGS. The former bill comes from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it the intention of the leadership to finish this schedule tomorrow or Friday, or what do you hope and anticipate?

Mr. BOGGS. We hope to finish this schedule by tomorrow night. If we do, we hope to go over until Monday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. When will the schedule for next week be announced? Tomorrow?

Mr. BOGGS. Sometime tomorrow afternoon.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 295]

Adams	Ford,	O'Brien
Albert	William D.	O'Konski
Andrews,	Goodell	Patten
Glenn	Gray	Powell
Aspinall	Hagan, Ga.	Purcell
Bolling	Hanna	Race
Callaway	Hansen, Idaho	Rees
Cameron	Hungate	Reinecke
Carter	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Tex.
Casey	King, N.Y.	Roncalio
Conte	Kluczyński	Roybal
Conyers	Long, Md.	Rumsfeld
Corman	McDade	St Germain
Davis, Ga.	McEwen	Senner
Dorn	McMillan	Sickles
Dyal	Mackay	Stratton
Edmondson	Martin, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Ellsworth	Martin, Mass.	Toll
Evans, Colo.	Mathias	Watts
Farbstein	Miller	Willis
Farnsley	Morrison	Wilson, Bob
Fisher	Morton	
Flood	Murray	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DISCUSSION OF REPUBLICAN PROPOSALS ON CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order today for 1 hour to discuss the Republican proposals on congressional reorganization. Congressmen DURWARD HALL, JAMES CLEVELAND, and I will start off on the basis of our joint findings in the congressional reorganization report. Today I have introduced in the House enabling legislation, H.R. 17873, which is an identical bill to one being introduced by Senator MONROE, the chairman of this joint committee. I hope that some of those interested in congressional reorganization and how to make Congress more effective will have the opportunity this afternoon to participate in this special order.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL LABOR

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on General Labor be permitted to sit this afternoon in hearings on the impact of imports as related to the minimum wage. I have discussed it with the ranking minority member, and it is agreeable to him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CLAYTON L. EVENS—100 YEARS YOUNG

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I had the privilege of meeting and congratulating Clayton L. Evens on the occasion of his 100th birthday.

There were many things that inspired me in my brief talk with Mr. Evens, but the most inspiring was his dedication to his American citizenship as evidenced by his insistence at the age of 100 of walking to the polling place and casting his vote in a primary election. This, I think, illustrates the value that Clayton L. Evens places upon his American citizenship and should be a challenge and an inspiration to those of our citizens who fail

to exercise their franchise even on general election day.

Clayton L. Evens is a delightful person, the product of hard work and clean living. He still is hale, hearty and healthy, and interested in family, friends, and community at the age of 100.

I know the Members of this House will be interested in his background. He was born September 18, 1866, the son of Jacob L. and Agnes Lippincott Evens, and grew up on a farm located in Marlton, N.J., not far from his present residence.

After attending the Pine Grove School and the Westtown Friends Boarding School in Pennsylvania, he farmed with his father and brother. In 1893 he settled in Denver, Colo., and engaged himself in the hardware business.

After several years in Colorado he returned to his first love, his father's farm, and continued as a farmer until his retirement in 1949. He now resides with his nephew, Howard J. Evens, on Main Street, Marlton, N.J.

He has 1 niece, 6 great nieces and nephews, and 10 great-great nieces and nephews.

Sunday, September 18, was open house in Marlton at the Evens' home. Together with many of his friends, I had the pleasure of joining in "happy birthday" to a great American and a fine gentleman.

I wish for Mr. Evens many more years of good health, happiness, and God's blessings.

INCREASING POSITIONS IN GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2393) to authorize additional GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 positions for use in agencies or functions created or substantially expanded after June 30, 1965, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2047)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2393) to authorize additional GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 positions for use in agencies or functions created or substantially expanded after June 30, 1965, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That (a) section 5108(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) A majority of the Civil Service Commissioners may establish, and from time to time revise, the maximum numbers of posi-

tions (not to exceed an aggregate of 2,577, in addition to any professional engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and professional positions in the physical and natural sciences and medicine which may be placed in these grades, and in addition to 240 hearing examiner positions under section 3105 of this title which may be placed in GS-16 and 9 such positions which may be placed in GS-17) which may be placed in GS-16, 17, and 18 at any one time. However, under this authority, not to exceed 25 percent of the aggregate number may be placed in GS-17 and not to exceed 12 percent of the aggregate number may be placed in GS-18. A position may be placed in GS-16, 17, or 18 only by action of, or after prior approval by, a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners.

"(b) Section 5108(b) of such title is amended by inserting '(1)' immediately following the subsection designation, and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(2) In addition to the number of positions authorized by subsection (a) of this section and positions referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Librarian of Congress, subject to the procedures prescribed by this section, may place a total of 28 positions in the Library of Congress in GS-16, 17, and 18."

"(c) Section 5108(c) (1), relating to positions in GS-16, 17, and 18 for the General Accounting Office, is amended by striking out '39' and inserting in lieu thereof '64'.

"(d) Section 5108(c) (2), relating to positions in GS-16, 17, and 18 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is amended by striking out '75' and inserting in lieu thereof '110'.

"(e) The Act entitled 'An Act to provide certain administrative authorities for the National Security Agency, and for other purposes', approved May 29, 1959 (50 U.S.C. 402, note), as amended, is amended—

"(1) by striking out, in section 2 thereof, 'sixty-five such officers and employees' and inserting in lieu thereof 'seventy such officers and employees'; and

"(2) by striking out, in section 4 thereof, 'sixty civilian positions' and inserting in lieu thereof 'ninety civilian positions'.

"(f) Section 3301 of title 39, United States Code, relating to personnel requirements of the postal field service, is amended by striking out '70 employees assigned to salary levels 18, 19, and 20' and inserting in lieu thereof '55 employees assigned to salary levels 19 and 20'."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
DAVID N. HENDERSON,
H. R. GROSS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

MIKE MONRONEY,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
FRANK CARLSON,
HIRAM L. FONG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2393) entitled "An Act to authorize additional GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 positions for use in agencies or functions created or substantially expanded after June 30, 1965", submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill, which passed the Senate on September 1, 1965, amended section 505(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as

amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(b)), so as to increase the maximum number of positions in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 of the General Schedule of such Act allowable under such section 505(b) from 2,400 to 2,500 and further provided that 100 of such positions shall be available only for allocation, with the approval of the President, for agencies or functions created or substantially expanded after June 30, 1965.

The House amendments to the Senate bill struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text and provided a new title for the bill.

With respect to the House amendment to the text of the Senate bill, the committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the text of the Senate bill and the text provided by the House amendment and that the House agree to the same.

Subsection (a) of the House amendment to the text of the Senate bill amended section 505(b) of the Classification Act of 1949 to the following effect:

First, the House version increased from 2,400 to 2,700 the maximum number of positions which may be placed at any one time in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 of the General Schedule of such Act.

Second, the House version removed certain limitations on the position allocation authority under section 505(b) by eliminating certain provisions which provided that—

"(1) not to exceed 25 per centum of such maximum number of positions may be placed in GS-17 and not to exceed 12 per centum of such maximum number of positions may be placed in GS-18;

"(2) fifty of such positions shall be available only for allocation, with the approval of the President, for agencies or functions created after the date of enactment of this provision;

"(3) fourteen of such positions shall be available only for allocation to the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

"(4) six of such positions shall be available only for allocation to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice; and

"(5) four of such positions shall be available only for allocation to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board."

The conference substitute increases such maximum number of positions from 2,400 to 2,577.

In addition, the conference substitute eliminates the existing limitations on the positions referred to in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5), immediately above, with respect to the President, the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, but retains the existing 25 per centum limitation with respect to GS-17 and 12 per centum limitation with respect to GS-18, referred to in paragraph (1) immediately above.

Subsection (b) of the House version amended section 505(c) of the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the Librarian of Congress to place a total of 35 positions in the Library of Congress in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 of the General Schedule of such Act, in addition to the number of positions otherwise authorized by law to be placed in such grades but subject, however, to the procedures prescribed by section 505. Under the House version, it was contemplated that the actual increase in the number of positions for the Library of Congress in such grades would be 13 positions because of the legislative intent of the House that the existing number of such positions assigned or to be assigned to the Library by the United States Civil Service Commission under section 505(b)—that is, 22 positions—would

henceforth be authorized for the Library under section 505(c), as amended by the House, leaving 13 additional positions to be filled by the Librarian of Congress under the new limitation of 35 positions for the Library proposed by the House.

The Senate version had no such provision for the Library of Congress.

Subsection (b) of the conference substitute proposes an authorization for the Library of Congress of a total of 28 positions in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 of the General Schedule, subject, however, to the intent of the conference substitute that the existing number of positions in the Library assigned to GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 by the United States Civil Service Commission under its general authority—that is, 22 positions—will henceforth be authorized for the Library out of the total of 28 positions authorized by the conference substitute, making a total of 6 additional positions for the Library under the conference substitute.

The above-mentioned 22 positions formerly allocated by the Civil Service Commission to the Library of Congress under section 505(b) of the Classification Act of 1949 will constitute a part of the maximum number of 2577 positions authorized for future allocation by the Commission under section 5108(a) of title 5, United States Code, as set forth in the conference substitute.

Subsection (c) of the House version amended section 505(d) of the Classification Act of 1949 so as to increase from 39 to 70 the number of GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 positions authorized for the General Accounting Office in addition to the number otherwise authorized to be allocated by law to such grades.

The Senate version contained no such provision.

Subsection (c) of the conference substitute amends section 5108(c) (1) of title 5, United States Code, so as to increase from 39 to 64 the number of GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 positions authorized for the General Accounting Office in addition to the number otherwise authorized to be allocated by law to such grades—an increase of 25 positions.

Subsection (d) of the House version amended section 505(e) of the Classification Act of 1949 to increase from 75 to 125 the number of positions for the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, in addition to the number of positions otherwise authorized by law to be placed in such grades.

The Senate version contained no such provision.

Subsection (d) of the conference substitute amends section 5108(c) (2) of title 5, United States Code, so as to increase from 75 to 110 the number of positions for the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, in addition to the number of positions otherwise authorized by law to be placed in such grades—an increase of 35 positions.

Subsection (e) of the House version amended sections 2 and 4 of the Act of May 29, 1959 (50 U.S.C. 402, note), relating to additional positions of a GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 level for the National Security Agency and additional positions of such level for the National Security Agency involving research and development functions with salaries not in excess of the maximum General Schedule rate. Subsection (e) (1) of the House version increased from 65 to 75 the number of positions of the GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 level for the National Security Agency. Subsection (e) (2) of the House version increased from 60 to 90 the number of positions for such agency involving research and development functions.

The Senate version contained no such provisions.

Subsection (e) of the conference substitute provides for the National Security

Agency 5 additional positions of the GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 level, and 30 additional positions involving research and development functions with salaries not in excess of the maximum General Schedule rate.

Subsection (f) of the House version amended section 3301 of title 39, United States Code, which provides that the Postmaster General shall determine the personnel requirements of the postal field service and fix the number of supervisors and other employees in that service, with the exception that there may not be at any one time more than one assistant postmaster employed at any post office or a total of 70 employees assigned to salary levels 18, 19, and 20 in the postal field service.

Subsection (f) of the House version eliminated salary level 18 from the above limitation of 70 employees and, in effect, applied the limitation only to salary levels 19 and 20.

The Senate version contained no such provision.

Subsection (f) of the conference substitute, like the House version, removed salary level 18 from the employee limitation but reduced such limitation from 70 to 55 employees, thus providing, in effect, a limitation of 55 employees for salary levels 19 and 20 in the postal field service.

In addition to the foregoing substantive changes, the conference substitute makes certain technical changes which eliminate references to the Classification Act of 1949 and provide, in lieu thereof, references to the appropriate provisions of title 5, United States Code, recently enacted as positive law by Public Law 89-554.

With respect to the House amendment to the title of the Senate bill, the committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same in order to provide a title for the conference substitute which reflects the coverage of the conference substitute.

THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
DAVID N. HENDERSON,
H. R. GROSS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DULSKI (during reading of statement of the managers on the part of the House). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17787) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Re-

sources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 17787, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, yesterday we approved here on the floor a bill appropriating over \$3 billion to provide assistance to foreign countries. Today we will consider the public works appropriation bill which, excluding funds for the atomic energy program, providing only \$1.8 billion for the water resource development of our own Nation.

I think it is important that we make this comparison for we must guard against unwise action that would unduly retard our own future development at the expense of helping others. I have supported foreign aid down the years, but I am concerned at the tendency to practice greater economy at home than we do in some of our foreign programs. I am likewise concerned at the tendency to place greater emphasis on some of the newer, more glamorous domestic programs and neglect the programs basic to the development and preservation of our great natural resources. We must maintain a reasonable balance in the allocation of our budgeted resources or we will see the day when we will pay a far greater price in an effort to meet the expanding needs of our own Nation for water, flood control, irrigation, and transportation.

I fully support efforts to economize on the Federal expenditures and we are doing it in this bill—it is \$214.6 million below last year's appropriations and \$56 million under the budget request. But compared with the appropriations we are providing in other areas, I cannot help but feel that, on balance, we are allocating far too little of our Nation's budget to reducing the great backlog of work in the essential water resource development of our Nation.

Let us look at some comparisons that make me wonder if we are wise in the allocation of our Federal budget resources:

We recently appropriated \$58 billion for the Department of Defense, just for this year—this is more than four times the funds expended by the Corps of Engineers since 1824 for all the new work—

flood control, water supply, navigation, and so forth.

We just appropriated \$5 billion for the space program for this year; this is four times the appropriation in this bill for the Corps of Engineers. We are not making even a dent in the \$6 billion backlog of authorized projects needed for flood control, water supply, navigation, and so forth. Is the space program four times as important as preventing flood damages and providing urgently needed water supply here at home?

It just happens that the \$5 billion for space for 1 year is about the same amount we have spent in 64 years on the reclamation program since it was started in 1902. And that \$5 billion is being repaid by the water users and from power revenues.

Yesterday we approved \$2.3 billion for economic assistance to foreign countries; yet this bill includes only \$1.8 billion for water resource development of our own country.

We are spending over \$2 billion for research and development of a supersonic airliner so we can get to Paris in 3 hours instead of 7 hours; this money would finance one-third of the total cost of the backlog of 399 authorized pending projects of the Corps of Engineers on which construction has not been started. The money we appropriated this year for the supersonic airliner—\$280 million—is \$30 million more than the funds in this bill for the entire construction program for the current year of the Bureau of Reclamation.

I noted in the report on the foreign aid bill that AID claimed in fiscal year 1965 alone that over 1 million new acres were irrigated and more than 650,000 acres were reclaimed.

The best we can claim in our report is 9 million acres and that is not for fiscal year 1965 but rather represents all we have accomplished in the 64 years since the reclamation program started in 1902.

The same foreign aid report states that AID claims that "more than 90 million people benefited from water supply facilities" in fiscal year 1965 alone.

The best we can claim in our report on this bill is that the projects of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation help meet the water supply needs of 14.4 million people.

I am not opposed to these other programs, and I could cite many many more examples, but I think we must stop and ask ourselves "Are we operating on two sets of standards to the detriment of the old line programs which have been and remain so basic to the development of our economy?" In the years ahead, with our exploding population, a successful space program, a supersonic airliner, or the economic development of our friends in foreign countries is not going to be a very satisfactory substitute for the flood control, water supply, water quality control, irrigation, and the many other essential requirements of our home economy.

So I do not think we should try to balance the budget on this bill—maybe we can afford all the programs; but certainly we should not neglect or sacrifice our own vital water resource development programs.

I would like to take a few moments to outline for the Record some of the benefits which have resulted from the appropriations which have been made for the programs covered by this bill.

FLOOD CONTROL

Flood damages prevented by Corps of Engineers projects in operation reached a new high of \$1.5 billion during fiscal year 1965. It is estimated that over the years the accumulative flood damages prevented by all corps projects already exceeds \$14 billion. This is more than has been appropriated to the corps for construction of all types of projects since it was established in 1824 and is more than double the appropriations made for flood control. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that its reservoirs in the flood-stricken areas also assisted in the prevention of an estimated \$850 million in flood damages during 1965.

However, the large flood damages sustained during the recent floods shows that much remains to be done. For example, the disastrous 1965 spring floods in the upper Mississippi and Red River of the North basins resulted in the loss of some lives and damages amounting to about \$178 million. Completed and partially completed projects of the Corps of Engineers prevented damages estimated at over \$30 million. However, it is estimated that authorized projects not yet built would have prevented an additional \$124 million in damages.

The flood of June 16, 1965, caused damages in the Denver, Colo., metropolitan area estimated at \$325 million. The corps' Cherry Creek Reservoir, which cost only about \$15 million to construct, prevented damages estimated at \$130 million. Had the authorized Chatfield Dam been in operation at the time of the flood, practically all of the damages in the Denver metropolitan area would have been prevented and substantial damage reduction achieved in the stream reaches downstream from Denver.

In the Trinity and Brazos River Basins of Texas, \$16 million in damages occurred during the April-May 1966 floods, but another \$52 million worth was prevented by corps projects. In these basins, construction of projects already authorized would have eliminated most of the flood damages.

Flood damage emergency expenditures by both the Federal, State, and local governments have become excessive in recent years, totaling over \$205 million just in the last 4 years. A large portion of these expenditures would have been unnecessary had authorized flood control projects been completed and in operation.

The present value to the Nation of completed projects for navigation, reclamation, water supply, recreation, and power development is also evident.

NAVIGATION

The navigation system of harbors and waterways constructed by the Corps of Engineers now carry almost 1¼ billion tons of traffic annually principally in those commercial items which do not require rapid movement but which are

essential to the growing industrial economy of the Nation. Prominent among these commodities are 462 million tons—about 137 billion gallons—of petroleum and its products, 206 million tons of coal and coke, 146 million tons of iron ore, iron and steel, and 106 million tons of sand, gravel, and stone. The waterways now carry annually about 250 billion ton-miles of freight traffic, continuing their increasing trend, and account for the movement of approximately one-sixth of the total ton-mileage of the Nation's intercity traffic.

At the same time, the more than 240 million acre-feet of storage space provided in nearly 300 Corps of Engineers reservoirs completed or under construction constitute a significant national resource for conserving the water and controlling the flows of our rivers to help meet the growing water supply requirements of thousands of industries and hundreds of American communities. It is estimated that from 1952 through 1965, a total of 5,882 new industrial plant projects were established in the United States on the inland river banks to obtain the increasingly important advantages of water transportation, water supply, and other water uses.

RECLAMATION

Bureau of Reclamation facilities have been provided to serve over 9 million acres of arid western land. Reclamation harvests have added some \$23 billion in crop income to the economic development of the West.

WATER SUPPLY

The corps now provides over 4 million acre-feet of storage for water supply in 38 reservoirs, which supplements the water supply for more than 2 million people. A dependable water supply estimated at 2 billion gallons a day is developed from storage now in operation. In addition, in 1965 water deliveries from Bureau of Reclamation projects involved a daily water supply of 1.5 billion gallons from 98 reservoirs to meet the domestic and industrial needs of 12.4 million people.

RECREATION

Corps of Engineers and Reclamation projects also provide ever increasing outdoor recreation benefits. It is estimated that attendance at 446 recreation areas totaled over 200 million visitors during 1965.

POWER REVENUES

Installed hydroelectric capacity of major Federal agencies covered by the bill totaled 30 million kilowatts at the end of fiscal year 1965 with a net generation of 130 billion kilowatt hours. Electric operating income for fiscal year 1965 totaled \$534 million.

AUTHORIZATION PROCESS

It should be noted that public works projects, before they are eligible for funding, are subject to a most exhaustive review process to assure they are economically justified. After thorough study by the responsible agency and clearance with all other agencies involved, they are carefully reviewed by the legislative committees of Congress before they are authorized by law. Each project must

meet stringent criteria to assure benefits will fully justify the cost. A large percentage of the projects also require assurance of local cooperation, including repayment of the benefits derived from water supply and irrigation, before construction is initiated.

FUNDING REQUIREMENTS BACKLOG

The urgency of expediting the funding of public works projects to the greatest extent feasible is evidenced by the fact that the Corps of Engineers has estimated that new work at a cost of \$28.2 billion will have to be undertaken if water development needs are to be met by 1980. This will require annual expenditures more than double the current rate. There are currently over 724 authorized projects in the active civil works program which will require about \$11.6 billion to complete. Of this group, construction has not yet been started on 399 projects with an estimated cost of \$6.4 billion. This latter group includes 254 projects for which initial planning funds have not as yet been appropriated.

UNBUDGETED REQUESTS

The committee heard testimony from over 1,600 witnesses requesting funds for unbudgeted projects and to increase the amounts on budgeted projects. This included over 180 Members of Congress who proposed increases in the budget for fiscal year 1967 totaling over \$181 million involving 326 projects. The total cost of these projects is estimated at over \$2.5 billion. Due to the present budgetary situation, the committee felt that it was justified in implementing only the highest priority requests for new construction starts. Emphasis has been placed on funding of projects in the study and planning stage because of the small current expenditures involved and in order that they might be ready for the initiation of construction as soon as larger capital expenditures in the economy are warranted.

Although the committee has included funds for 24 unbudgeted new construction starts, they involve appropriations of only \$23,633,000 for fiscal year 1967 and have a total estimated cost of only \$364.7 million with a balance of \$332 million to be funded over a period of years after fiscal year 1967. Of the added new starts, 14 have a total cost of less than \$10 million. The highest cost, \$74 million, involves the Chatfield Dam project at Denver, Colo. In this instance the Bureau of the Budget advised the committee it would have no objection to the appropriation of funds in the bill to initiate construction. As the Corps of Engineers is completing 36 projects in fiscal year 1967 with a total estimated cost of \$463.5 million, the unbudgeted construction starts added by the committee, together with the new budgeted starts, add only \$151.5 million to the level of the construction pipeline of the corps. In addition, the committee has recommended funds for 28 unbudgeted surveys and for initiation of planning on 29 unbudgeted projects.

The budget request, which is also recommended by the committee, includes 38 new studies, 27 planning starts, and 25 construction starts under the Corps of

Engineers. The committee has also approved four new construction starts budgeted for the Bureau of Reclamation and the two budgeted for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

INCREASED COSTS OF RELOCATIONS

The committee is concerned over the increased construction costs being incurred on projects for highway, railroad, and other relocations. Although the committee fully appreciates that required relocations should result in no loss to the parties involved, it is not convinced that in many instances they are being accomplished in the most economical and reasonable manner possible. For example, on the John Day lock and dam project, in Oregon, relocations estimated to cost \$64.9 million in 1958 are actually costing in excess of \$160 million. The railroad relocations alone on this project are now estimated to cost about \$107 million compared with the earlier estimate of \$45.7 million. Railroad and road relocations on the Libby Reservoir project, Montana, are now estimated to cost over \$177 million.

As the projects have widespread benefits in the areas concerned, the committee feels that the Federal Government should receive the fullest cooperation from State highway departments, the railroads, and other parties involved to assure that the relocations are affected at the lowest cost possible. In the future, the committee will expect to receive more detailed justifications of relocation costs and directs that the plans on major relocations hereafter be submitted to the committee prior to the initiation of construction.

RECREATION AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES

Although the committee supports the policies making adequate provision in projects for recreation and fish and wildlife facilities, it is concerned at the tendency in many project plans to reflect higher costs for these aspects than appear to be justified. The committee expects to carefully monitor estimates for these facilities in the future review of the estimates and will expect detailed justifications of any revisions of project plans.

LAKE ERIE-OHIO RIVER WATERWAY

While I am here, I would like to say a few words about the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal project, illustrated on this map. We have included \$500,000 in the bill to initiate planning. The map shows it is 2,400 miles from Buffalo to Pittsburgh by water, through the Great Lakes. But with this canal, connecting up the Ohio river near Pittsburgh to Lake Erie, a distance of only 120 miles, the route is only 400 miles.

Now, if someone were coming out of the Congo, who could not read or write, he would realize the advantages of the shorter route compared with the present 2,400 miles. Two interesting events occurred in 1824, 144 years ago. The Army Corps of Engineers was organized in that year and the first railroad was built in the United States between Baltimore and Washington. And down through the 144 years the railroads have opposed this project just as they have every major waterway we have built.

In my hand I have a recommendation from the Army Engineers. It was for this canal and it is one of the first projects they recommended in the United States. This paper is dated February 14, 1825.

I have heard some say this project is for Youngstown, Ohio. Yet, Youngstown, Ohio, was not even there when the project was first recommended.

Down through the years the railroads have fought every effort to build the project and they are very active now. They have maintained high freight rates for moving coal and ore in the area and at the same time have fought the canal which would make cheaper transportation available.

I have dedicated my efforts over many years to make the waterway a reality, for it is vital not only to the economy of the Beaver-Mahoning Valley but to the Nation. Without the transportation advantages the canal will bring to the Beaver-Mahoning Valley, this great steel producing area will continue to decline—being unable to compete favorably with areas enjoying cheap water transportation for the movement of coal and iron ore.

Many misleading figures, distortions, and false claims have been put out concerning this project by the opposition so I would like to set the record straight on a few facts.

First, using the valleys of the Grand River on the Lake Erie side, and the Mahoning and Beaver Rivers on the Ohio River side, the 120-mile-long canal would cross the divide between the 2 basins by means of 10 dams with dual locks. The Lake Erie terminus would be about 30 miles east of Cleveland, and the Ohio River terminus at Rochester, Pa., about 25 miles below Pittsburgh. At the summit of the divide, the Grand River would be dammed to form a reservoir from which the canal would draw its water.

For most of its length, the depth of the waterway finally recommended by the Board would be 12 feet; and the width, 300 feet. However, in certain constricted reaches, the depth would be increased to 15 feet and the width reduced to not less than 200 feet. The 10 navigation dams, 3 on the Lake Erie side of the divide and 7 on the south slope, would each have dual locks 84 feet wide and 720 feet long.

PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

The project was authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935, in the following terms:

The following works of improvement of rivers, harbors, and other waterways are hereby adopted and authorized, * * * : "Beaver and Mahoning Rivers, Pennsylvania and Ohio; of the width and depth provided in House Document Numbered 277, Seventy-Third Congress, as a Federal project and to continue to Lake Erie at or near Ashtabula, Ohio, subject to the final approval of the whole project from the Ohio River to Lake Erie by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors; * * * "

In its report of December 20, 1938—House Document 178, 76th Congress, 1st session—the Board of Engineers stated that—

The Board now concludes that the whole project from the Ohio River to Lake Erie,

with certain modifications of the plans proposed in House Document No. 277, Seventy-Third Congress, Second Session, is economically justified.

After a careful review of the matter, Congressman Joseph J. Mansfield, then chairman of the River and Harbor Committee of the House, in a letter dated April 15, 1939, to the Chief of Engineers, stated:

It is obvious, likewise, that the Board did approve the whole project from the Ohio River to Lake Erie via the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers, and consequently the authorization enacted by Congress in the 1935 River and Harbor Act has been fully met, and the approval and authorization by Congress are complete.

A current economic reevaluation of the Lake Erie-Ohio River project has been completed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. It has again concluded that the project is fully justified. The Board's recommendations in its report dated September 7, 1966, are as follows:

The Board concludes that the whole project from the Ohio River to Lake Erie is economically justified and accordingly recommends it for construction substantially in accordance with the plan of the District Engineer, with channel depths of 12 feet, except in the restricted reaches through Youngstown and Warren, Ohio, where a depth of 15 feet would be provided, and with such further modifications as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable.

Opponents have claimed that the project should be reauthorized before being eligible for funding. There is no precedent for requiring a project, once authorized, to be reauthorized. The long established practice on projects which have been inactive for a period of years is to require a detailed current economic restudy by the Corps of Engineers and if the final report is favorable to proceed with appropriations to initiate planning. This course has been followed on many occasions and in the 1967 bill over 30 projects are being funded which were authorized prior to 1940.

ECONOMIC RESTUDY

The economic restudy of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal was financed by Congress in 1961 and the corps has spent over 5 years conducting an exhaustive reanalysis of all aspects of the project. In making its favorable report, concluding the project was economically justified, and recommending it for construction, the U.S. Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors stated:

In arriving at its decision, the Board had before it the favorable recommendations of the Corps' Pittsburgh District and Ohio River Division, both of which had extensively studied the proposal and compiled a voluminous record of testimony. The Board not only studied this record and additional information furnished by interested parties during the period of review, but also sent its own staff members to the field for on-the-spot investigations, and thoroughly scrutinized and rechecked all engineering and economic calculations.

Particular attention has been given to all questions which might materially affect the engineering feasibility or the economic justification of the project, and adjustments have been made where appropriate.

The division report consists of 5 volumes and over 700 pages.

The engineering record of the Corps of Engineers speaks for itself. Since 1824 they have had the responsibility for waterway development in the Nation. There are now over 19,000 miles of waterways carrying commercial traffic and the benefits have exceeded the cost by over 3 to 1.

The engineering record of the corps in the construction of flood control facilities is also outstanding. The corps has spent about \$4.4 billion on its flood control program and the projects have already prevented flood damages amounting to more than \$14 billion—a ratio of benefits over costs of 3.2 to 1.

BENEFIT-TO-COST RATIO

The Corps of Engineers estimates that the ratio of average annual benefits for the Lake Erie to Ohio River Waterway to average annual costs will be 1.3 to 1. For every dollar spent, the benefits will be \$1.30. The corps estimates benefits at \$66 million per year based primarily on savings in the movement of iron ore, coal, limestone, and steel mill products. There will also be substantial recreational and flood control benefits, according to the corps. No benefits have been allocated to area redevelopment.

Experience shows that the Corps of Engineers has actually been far too conservative in its estimates of the traffic to be attracted to the major waterways it has investigated. For example, in 1908, the corps based its recommendations on the Ohio River navigation project upon traffic of only 9 million tons; the waterway wasn't completed until 1929, but by 1950, the tonnage was close to 49 million tons. The latest estimate shows the waterway carried about 102 million tons in 1965—better than 11 times the corps' original estimate, and this has taken place less than 40 years after the project went into full operation. In 1930, the traffic estimate for the upper Mississippi River improvement was only 9 million tons. It was opened to traffic in 1940 and by 1950 the tonnage was over 11 million. By 1965 it was up to about 35 million—or four times the corps' original estimate.

PROJECT COST

The Federal cost, as estimated in detail by the corps, is \$917 million. Local interests must pay \$95 million, or about 10 percent. This is a far greater local assessment than on most Federal navigation projects. The Federal cost is high, but not in comparison to Federal expenditures on many other projects. We are now spending, for example, \$1.2 billion to develop the Arkansas River. Over \$1 billion has been spent by the Federal Government on water projects in California, just in the last 10 years. The Central Valley project in California has a total Federal cost of \$1.7 billion. The Columbia River Basin development program of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers has a total cost of \$4.8 billion, including \$750 million in new power facilities now underway as a result of the Canadian treaty. The total cost of the Mississippi River and tributaries project is \$2.3 billion.

The upper Colorado River storage project is costing \$1.2 billion.

It is not intended that the project will be constructed during the current period of inflation. Rather, it will take at least 4 years to plan at a small annual cost. Construction, which would be spread over at least an 8- to 10-year period, would not be undertaken until larger public works expenditures are warranted in the economy.

CAPACITY OF WATERWAY TO CARRY ESTIMATED TRAFFIC

The U.S. Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors states the following, after its 5-year review, concerning the capability of the canal to carry the tonnage on which the transportation savings are estimated:

The capability of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal to carry the tonnage for which transportation savings were estimated was carefully considered. It was estimated that 50 million tons, out of the 62 million tons per year anticipated in the 50th year of project life, would move through the most critical reach. Based on the preliminary design of project features presented by the District and Division Engineers the projected tonnage could be passed. This is supported by recent experience on existing comparable waterways within the Pittsburgh District which has demonstrated that tonnages of the magnitude anticipated could move over the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal. In the final design, modifications can be made in the project features which would assure dependable capability of the waterway to carry the projected tonnage.

EFFECT ON LAKE ERIE

The U.S. Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors made a special study of the question of possible effects of the canal on the water level of Lake Erie and Corps stated in the report as follows:

Since the water supply for the canal will be taken not from Lake Erie but from the summit reservoir on the Grand River, the effect of the canal on the level of Lake Erie is believed to be insignificant. The Board noted that the 1909 treaty with Great Britain governing the international-waters aspects of the Great Lakes stands as a guarantee against operations injurious to the lake.

On occasion, it might prove advantageous to pump water up to the summit pool from Lake Erie. However, such water would be returned to the lake as it carries vessels down through the locks. Water could be pumped up to the reservoir and subsequently released from the reservoir down to the lake, generating power en route with reversible pump-turbines. The Board recommended further study of this aspect of the project proposal.

EFFECT ON WATER QUALITY

In regard to the effect of the project on water quality, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concluded in the report as follows:

The District Engineer, in estimating the effects of the proposed project on water quality, used data on streamflow requirements furnished by the United States Public Health Service in its report included in Appendix V of the District Engineer's report. He concluded that additional flows under canalized conditions would result in temperature reduction in the Mahoning River the value of which would slightly exceed the adverse effect resulting from the reduction in the assimilation ability of the river under pool conditions. A restatement of the United States Public Health Service's posi-

tion subsequently furnished the Division Engineer concludes that if the storage in Grand River Reservoir is used to increase the average minimum flow in the Mahoning River at Youngstown by approximately 200 cubic feet per second, the proposed waterway would not have an adverse effect on water quality. The Division Engineer believes that this condition can be met. Therefore, the analysis concerning water quality contained in the District Engineer's report is considered to be acceptable.

Now these are a few facts which I hope will set the record straight. They are not my facts, but rather the findings of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers who have studied this project for years. They are the recognized authorities on waterway engineering and economics in this country.

So I ask you to support this project and the entire bill. These funds are to be expended only in and on America.

What will happen if we do not build up this country? Stop to think of the 13 million tons of steel, for example, coming into this country this year. It was only 10 million tons last year. Foreign imports are increasing annually and we must conserve and develop our great natural resources if we are to continue to compete favorably in the world.

That is why I am asking you here today to do some thinking—and I mean thinking. It is essential that we guard against unduly retarding the reasonable steps that must be taken to conserve and develop the water resources of the Nation. Fundamental to the continued growth of our Nation is adequate provision for water supply, flood control, navigation, reclamation, and power development. Without the investment that has been made to date in these programs, it would not have been possible to achieve the great progress that this country has enjoyed and reasonable program expansion must be fully supported in the future if the Nation is to continue to develop and prosper.

This is a very reasonable bill—it is \$56 million under the budget and \$214.6 million under last year. Yet we have made every effort to make provision for the highest priority requirements so that our water resource development program will move forward.

So I ask you to support the committee and vote against any amendments that may be offered to cut the bill. Every project in the bill is authorized and well justified. It is a good bill and deserves your full support.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion and in the opinion of most of the minority of the committee, this is a good bill, a bill which should be supported by the Members of this House. I want to express my personal gratitude to and admiration for the gentleman from Ohio who has preceded me in the well for the hard and effective work which he has done. These felicitations also go to the majority members of the committee, but more particularly to the minority members. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], and the gentleman from New

York [Mr. ROBISON], who have given me their good will, their loyalty, and their effective, intelligent support.

Mr. Chairman, we have had good hearings. I think if you look at the records of the hearings, you will see that every question which is a reasonable question has been answered. There is a great amount of data and factual information which would stand any Member in good stead who wants to understand this program better.

I think it is interesting to note on page 5 of the report of the committee the status of the public works program of the United States as compared to the needs of the country for public works. You will notice on page 5 that the Corps of Engineers alone estimates that they have a \$28.2 billion requirement for water development needs to be met by 1980 in order for the United States of America to have a sufficient water supply. There are currently over 724 authorized projects in the active civil works program which will require about \$11.6 billion to compete. Of this group construction has not yet been started on 399 projects with an estimated cost of \$6.4 billion. Very considerable sums in addition will be required by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, and the antipollution program.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, if this committee can be criticized for anything, it can be criticized for not going as far to catch up with the needs of the country, as we should have gone. I recognize the financial situation of the country today. I recognize the needs for great expenditures for military equipment and activities such as our requirements in Vietnam in particular and in the rest of the world in general. Again I know there are good, sufficient, and valid reasons why we cannot go any further than we have in this bill. We were certainly urged to do so.

There were requests from 180 Members of Congress for unbudgeted starts involving 326 projects which would have cost \$181 million this year. The total cost of these projects would be \$2.5 billion. Of these requests we have actually granted 24 new starts which will add to the expenditures for fiscal year 1967 the sum of \$23,633,000 or a total expenditure of only \$364.7 million. Of this \$364.7 million, \$74 million goes for one project, the Chatfield Dam in Colorado, which was taken into this bill over the budget but with the tacit agreement of the Bureau of the Budget because of the ruinous flood which was experienced in the Denver, Colo., area last year.

The bill, Mr. Chairman, adds up to something like this: On unbudgeted starts there is the figure of \$364.6 million. On budgeted starts there is the total of \$250 million. Thus, the input into the pipeline of the Corps of Engineers is \$615 million. The Corps of Engineers will, this year, complete projects totaling \$463.5 billion. Thus, the total addition to the pipeline as a result of this bill is only \$151.2 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is to be compared with the fact that \$28.2 billion must be spent by the year 1980 in Corps

of Engineers activities alone in order for this country not to have a water crisis.

So, Mr. Chairman, to me this bill merely holds the line. It is not progressing as far as we should progress on the things which we need to do in order to insure for the future of this country a plentiful supply of that product of nature most needed by man—other than clean air—and that is clean water.

Mr. Chairman, we have some controversial items contained in this bill.

We have items such as the Idaho Power Line which the Bonneville Power Administration seeks to build and it is in controversy for the third year. We expect it to be settled this year.

Mr. Chairman, we have included in the committee report our general ideas as to the form this contract should take.

It is our hope that reasonable men will be able to get together and conclude this agreement long before this bill comes up again for consideration next year. We do not expect it to be necessary for the Federal Government to construct this line.

Mr. Chairman, we have also increased the budget in the Mississippi River Basin. We did this in order to try to get at a level of expenditure in that great area of this country commensurate with the results which must be accomplished. We have only recommended the appropriation of money which we feel can be expended wisely on these projects in this fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult to cut too much in any given area, because if you do, then you get the construction pace down below an economic level. We feel that it would be penny wise and pound foolish to do this—especially in the Mississippi Basin which has been ravaged by floods so often in the past. So, we raised the appropriation to a level which in our opinion is proper.

Mr. Chairman, it is not easy to cut a public works appropriation bill. It is not easy to save money in such a bill and thereby really further governmental economy by doing so. It is not true that the easiest thing to do is to cut public works. It has been my experience over the period of time which I have served in this Congress that if you cut back, below an economic level, you end up by spending more money in the long run than should have been expended for the particular project.

As far as I personally am concerned, I do not know of any activities other than defense expenditures which are of higher import to the whole country than those we find represented in this bill. This is an important bill. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has so ably said, this bill is taking the American taxpayers' money and using it to build up this country.

I cannot help but point to the words which are above the Speaker's desk, the quotation from Daniel Webster—"Let us develop the resources of our land and call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our own time and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered." I think he

spoke wisely, and gave advice which is as worthy of consideration today as it was when the words were uttered.

The accomplishments of this program are worth recounting.

The waterways which have been built over the years now carry 1¼ billion tons of freight annually. Mainly this is bulk freight which does not need to be moved in a hurry. The economy of the country certainly has been well served by the fact that there are cheap ways of transporting large, bulky items of supplies throughout the country.

As far as reclamation is concerned, there are 9 million acres which are now under irrigation and these lands have furnished crops which have been worth \$23 billion to our economy.

The M. & I. water supply which has been furnished by the activities of the Corps of Engineers amounts to about 4 million acre-feet of clean water annually. The Bureau of Reclamation has furnished about 3 million acre-feet of clean water annually for a total of 7 million acre-feet of clean water now available through the activities which are represented in this bill.

In the Corps of Engineers' reservoirs alone recreational facilities have been used by 200 million people in the year 1965 alone.

So there is a great amount of good being engendered by this bill. It is a bill which is, in my opinion, well within the limits of propriety. I think all of us must look ahead in the years to come to the need to expand this activity greatly to put our country in position to take care of the physical needs of the population which we will have in the future. I hope we will be able to do it gradually, looking ahead and planning wisely, so that we can do it both economically and expeditiously. The time for starting these plans has now arrived. As far as I personally am concerned, when we are able to get the international situation stabilized to a point where such a large share of our national wealth must not be used in national defense, then I, for one, will be leading the charge for more adequate efforts to satisfy the needs and desires of our people for development of our water resources.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, when legislation of the magnitude of the public works appropriation bill reaches the floor of the House, there is ample testimony available as to what the bill will do. But what of the things that the bill will not do?

A request was made to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works to include in this bill an appropriation of \$250,000 to meet a sacred commitment to men who are dying in Vietnam. It is the law of the land that national cemeteries shall be established and shall be expanded according to need. It is the law of the land that such need will be determined by officials of the executive establishment and acted upon by them. They are charged with responsibility for burying the dead of our wars and the veterans of those wars.

Mr. Chairman, that responsibility is not being met. We cannot explain away

the fact that men who have given their lives in Vietnam have been denied burial in a national cemetery. These denials are continuing and they will increase.

It might be thought that these denials are happenstance, that they could not result from a conscious act or omission. But the fact is that this administration has continued a policy affirmed in 1961 that the national cemeteries are to be closed. Members might well ask who it was it who decided that certain of our dead servicemen should continue to receive the honor of burial in a national cemetery while others would be effectively denied such honor.

Time has run out for the New Jersey serviceman and his family. Time ran out in February of this year. Since then more than 31 servicemen killed on active duty have been denied burial at Beverly National Cemetery. During that same period 17 servicemen killed on active duty were buried at Beverly—after it closed.

The natural question is, How was it decided who would be interred at Beverly and who would be turned away? As to this, Mr. Chairman, it was mere chance. Actually the administration policy on national cemeteries is of the character of a lottery. If a serviceman or veteran has his home in Minnesota, Oregon, or Washington, D.C., burial in a national cemetery is assured—for the next 50 years or more. If the serviceman or veteran is from New England or Wyoming or many other States, there is no national cemetery in the area. If the deceased is from New Jersey he may be buried in a national cemetery near his home or he may not—the chances are he will not. But it all depends on whether a vacant burial site is available at the time of burial. Many burial sites are reserved, even in a closed national cemetery. On occasion these reserved sites are released by survivors. If a family's request for burial of the serviceman's remains reaches the cemetery immediately following release of a reserved site, their request will be approved. More often than not it is denied.

Time has run out in New Jersey and it is fast running out in California. In the next few months the two national cemeteries still open in California will be closed. Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery in San Diego is expected to close before the end of this year. Golden Gate National Cemetery in San Bruno is expected to close this winter. When these two closures occur, the families of servicemen killed in Vietnam will be effectively denied the right to bury him in a national cemetery. The closest national cemeteries to California will be in El Paso, Tex., and Portland, Oreg.

Mr. Chairman, this lottery system of burial cannot be permitted to continue. The Congress has been remiss in permitting the situation to develop. The Appropriations Subcommittee, which has an opportunity to provide funds to reopen Fort Rosecrans and Golden Gate National Cemeteries, has failed to offer appropriations to correct a serious wrong. The Congress cannot permit the situation to continue.

The President knows of the situation. It has been brought to his attention. Let us pray that the killing in Vietnam shall soon stop. But it is fair to ask how great the casualty list would have to grow to insure that this matter gets the attention it deserves. If, instead of 31 servicemen having been denied burial, the number were 310, would there be a policy change? If the number were 3,100, no one in this body would doubt but that a change would ensue.

It is past time for the President and his administration to stop dragging their feet on this matter of meeting our commitment to our honored dead. It is past time also for the Congress and its leadership to act. To reopen Beverly National Cemetery and to keep open Fort Rosecrans and Golden Gate National Cemeteries involves no more than an act of simple duty.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I must take a moment to compliment the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], the members of the committee, and, in particular, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

I have traveled throughout the country as a member of the subcommittee on flood control of the House Public Works Committee. I have observed disastrous floods at firsthand, and I believe that you gentlemen have demonstrated very clearly, with an exceptional display of patience, your great and genuine concern for flood and disaster problems throughout the land, and I can point out the fact on the north coast of California, in my district alone we spent \$15 million on flood recovery work alone, because of the floods that occurred in December of 1964. Certainly, we can all agree, this bill represents an investment in America, and again I want to compliment the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman KIRWAN, and all members of this important committee for helping to solve the many problems relating to floods and water conservation in the country.

We are all deeply indebted to you for your patience, understanding, and the personal consideration given to our many requests. The same compliments should be extended to the very able staff of the committee, who have gone out of their way to assist me. On behalf of the people of my First Congressional District, I want to express my deep appreciation for all your efforts in our behalf.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, the distinguished and able and dedicated Member from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. I know of no subcommittee chairman who spends as much time working in the in-

terests of this Nation in the matter of public works and conservation than does he.

The bill which he brings to this floor I think emphasizes rather dramatically what that type of interest has done, and how much he has done to preserve and protect this great Nation of ours.

What I have said about the chairman, of course, goes as well for the other members of the subcommittee.

I also include a very brilliant, hard-working, and dedicated staff. In the person of Gene Wilhelm, chief of staff of this subcommittee, I think I can say without fear of contradiction this committee is privileged to possess one of the most able and one of the finest subcommittee executive staff members on the full Appropriations Committee.

The task of this committee is nowhere better emphasized than in a statistical rundown of what the committee hearings developed during the consideration of this appropriations bill. One thousand six hundred witnesses requested funds for unbudgeted projects and to increase the amounts on budgeted projects. Over 180 Members of Congress proposed increases in the budget for fiscal year 1967 totaling \$181 million involving 326 projects.

Mr. Chairman, the urgency of expediting the funding of public works projects to the greatest extent feasible is evidenced by the fact that the Corps of Engineers has estimated that new work at a cost of \$28.2 billion will have to be undertaken if water development needs are to be met by 1980. This will require annual expenditures more than double the current rate. There are currently over 724 authorized projects in the active civil works program which will require about \$11.6 billion to complete. Of this group, construction has not yet been started on 399 projects with an estimated construction of \$6.4 billion. This latter group includes 254 projects for which initial planning funds have not, as yet, been appropriated.

Faced with these staggering and disturbing statistics and facts, and conscious of the necessity of budget limitations, this committee felt that it was justified in implementing only the highest priority requests for new construction starts. Emphasis has also been placed, by committee action, on funding of projects in the study and planning stage because of the small current expenditures involved and in order that they might be ready for the initiation of construction as soon as larger capital expenditures in the economy are warranted.

Mr. Chairman, the vast majority of the public works projects in this bill deal with the problems of flood control and a determined effort to protect lives and property and to save the hundreds of millions of dollars of damages that floods cause.

Under general investigations, our committee recommended \$31,730,000. Within this item, 168 of these investigations are concerned with flood control.

Under construction, \$953,715,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1967. Two

hundred and sixty-six of the projects are for flood control and these projects are spread all over the Nation.

For the Mississippi River and tributaries, \$84,950,000 has been approved. And all of these projects are concerned with flood control.

In most of the Bureau of Reclamation recommendations, there is some element of flood control. However, the large flood damages sustained during the recent floods shows that much remains to be done. For example, the disastrous 1965 spring floods in the Upper Mississippi and Red River of the North Basins resulted in the loss of some lives and damages amounting to about \$178 million. Completed and partially completed projects of the Corps of Engineers prevented damages estimated at over \$30 million. It is estimated that authorized projects not yet built would have prevented an additional \$124 million in damages.

The flood of June 16, 1965, caused damages in the Denver, Colorado metropolitan area estimated at \$325 million. The corps' Cherry Creek Reservoir, which cost only about \$15 million to construct, prevented damages estimated at \$130 million. Had the authorized Chatfield Dam been in operation at the time of the flood, practically all of the damages in the Denver metropolitan area would have been prevented and substantial damage reduction achieved in the stream reaches downstream from Denver.

In the Trinity and Brazos River Basins of Texas, \$16 million in damages occurred during the April-May 1966 floods, but another \$52 million worth was prevented by corps projects.

So it is no wonder, Mr. Chairman, that Members of this Congress and this committee are concerned about what happens in their districts. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to all Members—and floods, of course, know no party lines—for the support that this bill does enjoy and has enjoyed by Members from all over the Nation.

I see the gentleman from Colorado on his feet. I am delighted to yield to him because the gentleman from Colorado and his colleagues did as persuasive a job in asking this committee to add additional funds for the construction of the Chatfield Dam as did any delegation in the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my compliments and respect to the chairman of the subcommittee and to the ranking minority member thereof, together with all the members for their kind consideration given me and the citizens of the city and county of Denver, and others who appeared before the committee to explain the tragic disaster that hit Denver, Colo., on June 16, 1965, and to point out that a number of years ago there was a dam constructed on what is known as the Cherry Creek River, known as the Cherry Creek Dam, which

was able to hold back much of the water and helped save Denver in many particulars.

Unfortunately, the South Platte, which has its headwaters at the beginning of Pike's Peak, had a big flood which caused damage to the extent of at least \$325 million in the city and county of Denver alone. If it had not been for the Cherry Creek Dam, there would have been additional damages. Therefore, I want to compliment the committee for seeing this problem and recognizing that the best interests of the country were served by the construction of the Chatfield Dam to prevent the disaster that occurred there a year ago. I thank them.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the distinguished gentleman from Colorado and his distinguished colleagues, Mr. McVicker and Mr. Evans, for what they have done with and their constant concern on this project. May I also add, that the people from Colorado, from the areas affected by this project, made a magnificent case for Hatfield Dam.

Mr. Chairman, I have said this before, but it bears repeating. This is the bill referred to as the "pork barrel" and writers and cartoonists have a field day lampooning the Members of Congress who are seeking to protect their districts.

This bill helps protect—to guard and develop its resources; to spread waters on the land to green and bloom our deserts; to engineer our waterways and harbors, enabling food, fiber, minerals, and the sinews of our industrial capacity and might to be shipped from their basic and naked origin to areas of manufacturing, development, and consumption.

This bill is for the realization of all this, and it is far more than this. It harnesses the tremendous, magnificent, potential power of water and spreads it, as energy, to lift the daily burdens of mankind and to ease his way with comfort and convenience.

It is the instrument by which our Nation curbs the ravaging, devastating consequences of uncontrolled and rushing water. This is the bill, Mr. Chairman, that has built the reservoirs, the dams, floodwalls, jetties, breakwaters, pumping stations to stop floods—to protect property and to save lives. All of these that have been constructed are eloquent monuments to the wisdom of the responsible agencies and to the Congress. For these projects have saved millions of dollars and many human lives. There is not a section of this country that has not felt and appreciated the value of the flood control projects that sprinkle this land.

This is a bill, Mr. Chairman, as has been so eloquently stated by the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], that "is an investment in America." I trust members of this Committee will support the action of the subcommittee.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am cast in an unpleasant role today, one which no one would covet, and

yet I believe sincerely a necessary role. I have undertaken it in spite of the charge that we have heard in the cloakrooms, or that Members will hear there or here on the floor before this day is over, that what I seek to do in connection with this bill would scuttle our public works program, would submarine our resources development—yes; that it would doom certain Members of this House to certain political oblivion.

But I speak as a friend of this program. For 15 years, since I first became a member of the subcommittee here involved, I believe I have been a knowledgeable supporter of this program. I speak today not to harm it, but to preserve it for the years ahead.

For a country in deep fiscal and economic trouble cannot adequately support this or any other program for the benefit of the people of this country in the years that lie ahead.

There will be some who will say, "Oh, I agree. I know we are in deep fiscal trouble. I know that civilian programs in this country need to be cut back. But my project is important to my people and I must fight for it."

I can sympathize with and understand that point of view.

There is a time for public works expansion, but I submit this is not that time. Within the next few months our involvement in Vietnam will exceed the involvement in Korea. Inflation is here. The fires are lighted, and they are fueled and fanned each day by the spending of this Government, the spending which is the jet of oxygen which sends the flames higher and higher.

Some will console themselves by saying, "Oh, there is really no harm done in appropriating this money. The President will not spend it. He is going to cut back on expenditures. He told us so."

Perhaps they are right. If we could be certain of that, then I believe there ought to be no hesitancy at all, because it would be easy to say, "Oh, we are not cutting out anything, really, so we ought to vote for reductions in the new money with alacrity, because by so doing we would help to melt down that \$110 billion sitting there under the control of the people of the executive branch of this Government over which we in this legislative branch of Government have lost all control."

It is a sad enough plight in which we find ourselves—this once proud legislative body of our Government, in which we appropriate each year a great deal more money than the President says he will spend. We turn it over to the bureaucracy, and then we go downtown to those same bureaucrats to compete for their favor in the doling out of the funds we have previously appropriated and turned over to them to spend at a time they see fit to do so.

So if this money is not going to be spent, if Members console themselves about appropriating money here that will not be spent because the President is not going to spend it, I cannot think of a better reason to fail to appropriate this additional money.

If you think it is not going to be spent, then we ought not to appropriate it to

the people in the executive department to pile up the \$110 billion already there. But if you think it will be spent, then I think it is the responsibility of this Congress to assure that it will not be spent. I do not intend to dwell on the critical fiscal condition of this country. Others have done it. If, as the President assured us, there is going to be a \$3 billion reduction in expenditures in this fiscal year, where do you think that money is going to come from? It must come from the civil programs of this Government. Those are the only ones that are subject to deferment. It cannot come from the critical defense requirements of this Nation in the difficult position in which we find ourselves today. This has been traditionally so.

You will recall when World War II broke out that the President announced—and the Congress went along with it—that we were going to cut back and there would not be any new projects of this kind until the war had been won. I can remember Korea. The present distinguished minority floor leader of this House and I represented the minority on this subcommittee at that time. Some of you will recall that in the years 1951 and 1952, when the present majority controlled this House, the budget was adhered to with respect to these programs because of Korea. Then in 1953 and 1954 when the present minority controlled this House, the same rules were applied because of Korea. Then in 1955 some of the members of this committee, and of the Committee on Appropriations will recall that there was a general feeling that the bars were down and the bill was heavily loaded with unbudgeted projects the first time around, but the gentleman from Massachusetts will well recall, for he and the gentleman from Michigan, the late beloved Mr. Rabaut, stood with those of us who felt that this was not the time to load that bill with a great number of unbudgeted projects. That bill was sent back to the subcommittee for the kind of cleaning up job that was needed.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman said that the President of the United States, on the night of Pearl Harbor, said that there would not be a dam or a reservoir built in America for the duration of the war. However, he built two dams in my district in Ohio. They worked three shifts around the clock in order to build them in a hurry. Thank God for those reservoirs, because right after they were built water flooded into the area and would have run into the open hearth furnaces and would have blown them up. The loss of steel production would have seriously retarded our war effort. We have to keep building in order to keep abreast of acts of God such as floods, and so forth and protect and promote our economic development.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Now, in 1966, in spite of Vietnam and in spite of inflation, there is involved in this bill

the general atmosphere that the bars are down. So nearly half of the Members of this House appeared before the subcommittee and asked for almost \$1 million apiece, on an average, for money to be inserted in this bill this year outside of the budget. They asked for not so much money individually in many cases, but those projects involve a commitment in this year and in years in the near future of \$2.5 billion. This subcommittee and the full committee went a long way down this unbudgeted road. Some 85 new projects are included here. Of course, as the chairman pointed out, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, there are already a substantial number of new projects included in the budget, and carried in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I can hear some of the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union ask, mentally, "Well, if this is true; if there has been all these additions, how come this bill is under the budget?"

Well, Mr. Chairman, I will answer the Members of the Committee frankly—it is under the budget.

But, Mr. Chairman, look at the manner in which it was done.

In the first place, this bill is under the budget overall to the extent of \$4.1 billion by \$56 million.

Well, \$64 million was taken out of the Atomic Energy Commission's budget, which leaves a net plus of \$8 million in the other and less critical portions of this bill.

And, then, Mr. Chairman, if the Members of the Committee would take a look at page 48 of the report, I can give to them another example as to how this bill is under the budget. Incidentally, this is one of the most informational reports that you will see on this or any other appropriation bill. But there you will note, in the next to the last item, "Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages and availability of carryover balances, after listing the amounts for all of the projects planned and constructed in civil works," then it shows \$95,700,000 carryover.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of the Budget in its efforts to bring down the total amount requested, subtracted this amount from the total, and the committee added another \$32 million of subtraction.

So, if you will take a look at that, you will notice that these reductions, so-called, do not represent an elimination of a number of projects nor a retrenchment of the program. And, further in the report, you see these latest projects beside which there have been placed fixed sum, and do not bank on it, because the total amount of money is not sufficient to carry out 100-percent budgeting for many of the projects that are herein listed.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper times I shall offer several amendments which have been placed on the Clerk's desk. They are designed to follow a pattern of which I would like to advise the Members of the Committee in this general debate.

No. 1, they are designed to strike the unbudgeted projects from this bill. And, Mr. Chairman, I know that this may

seem unfair and that this may lead some of the members of the Committee to say, "What are we doing—we should not do this—we are letting the people downtown decide this pattern rather than the Congress, which had this responsibility."

But, Mr. Chairman, I think all of us are practical in our understanding that if the President means what he says about reducing expenditures, he is going to clear funds for the projects that he put in his budget, and the others, unbudgeted, are going to be the first ones to be deprived of funds.

And I suggest this—that since this budget was submitted by the President, and if there are critical projects I submit that there is an obligation on the part of the Corps of Engineers and on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation to go to the Bureau of the Budget. And, there is a further obligation on the part of the Bureau of the Budget to come up and advise this subcommittee with respect to critical needs so that we will not be subjected to the charge, as we are now being subjected, that we are exceeding the President's budget in a number of these matters.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that there is a responsibility on the part of the interested parties involved and on the part of the administration to come forward to the subcommittee in an effort to explain their respective needs.

Second, the amendments would cut out projects which are primarily recreational in their purposes.

I do not think this Congress can with good faith, when this country is involved halfway around the world, appropriate money for recreational projects, new recreational projects in this country at this time.

Thirdly, there is a list of projects included in the budget, new starts which, in my opinion, without reflecting in some of these upon their essential merit, could very well be deferred until our country is in a better fiscal condition.

In order that Members may be advised, I will read into the Record at this point a list of budgeted projects of marginal value or easily deferrable:

Calumet River—turning basin.
Illinois waterway deepening, 12 feet.
Prairie du Rocher and vicinity.
Shoal Creek.
Bayou Grand Caillou.
Black River.
Marquette County.
New Rochelle and Echo Bay Harbors.
Lake Erie coast, Michigan and Ohio.
Lake Erie coast, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York.
Mill Creek.

There are certain planning and construction projects:

Eel River.
Lytel and Warm Creeks.
Ponce de Leon Inlet.
Richland Creek.
Paintsville Reservoir.
Atlantic City reimbursement.
Lukfata Reservoir.
Virginia Beach reimbursement.
Burnsville Reservoir.
R. D. Bailey Reservoir.
Dickey-Lincoln School project.
Martins Fork Reservoir.

Trinity River.

Trinidad Reservoir.

England Pond Levee.

There are five newly budgeted starts where the justification is for 50 percent or more recreational benefits.

These would include:

Virginia Key and Key Biscayne, Fla.

Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, Hawaii.

Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii.

Ocracoke Island, N.C.

Smithville Reservoir, Mo.

Then, finally, as a catchall at the end of the bill, I shall offer an amendment to add a new section 511 which would reduce the appropriated funds in all portions of this bill by 5 percent. This is not the Bow amendment as it has been called because the Bow amendment applies to expenditures. It traditionally has. This amendment applies to new money, to appropriations in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, my suggested amendments should not be interpreted as a blanket criticism of this committee nor of the bill itself. I certainly pay tribute for the great amount of careful work that has been done in connection with this bill. I pay tribute for the duplications which have been ferreted out of the bill. I pay tribute for the instructions for the solution of a number of knotty problems which are included in this report: tribute for the committee's sound backing of the Secretary of the Army in regulations which he issued in connection with premium pay for those who work in the Panama Canal Zone; tribute for the elimination of some ambitious empire buildings that were included in some phases of this bill.

At any time, this is a most difficult appropriation bill and I suggest that the high caliber of my colleagues who serve upon the subcommittee will attest to the recognition of that. But at this time of critical competition for available dollars, it is indeed more difficult than usual.

I strongly believe that if we are to keep faith with those who depend upon us for fiscal responsibility in this Congress, then there must be a retrenchment of the appropriated dollars included in this public works appropriation bill.

The amendments which I have outlined and which I intend to offer at the proper places as the Clerk reads the bill for amendment, would reduce this bill overall by approximately \$260 million, between 6 and 7 percent of the amount of money otherwise appropriated.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. The gentleman has very helpfully called to the attention of the members of this Committee from page 48 of the hearings a \$32 million difference between the budget estimate and the House allowance for an item entitled "Reduction for Anticipated Savings and Salvages at Availability of Carryover Balances."

May I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin what justification there is either in the experience of the subcommittee or in the hearings for this additional \$32 million in indicated savings under the column "House allowance"?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I believe the major justification for the additional amount credited as a reduction here was this: In this program there were about \$50 million more in carryover into the fiscal year than the Bureau of the Budget had anticipated; so that this \$30 million more was taken as a swipe at the additional \$50 million carryover, in addition to what appeared in the budget's estimated balance.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, in the report on H.R. 17787—page 55—is a direction by the committee that none of the appropriated funds be available to pay a Canal Zone differential in excess of 15 percent of the basic compensation.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that the basic legislation authorizing payment of this differential was reported originally by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and is within its legislative jurisdiction.

I also call attention to the fact that there is now pending in the circuit court of appeals an action by the Canal Zone employees on this very point.

Under the circumstances, I suggest that the inclusion of this language in the report is inappropriate since the Appropriations Committee does not have jurisdiction over the subject matter.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi as much time as he desires.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to serve on the Appropriations Committee and particularly on this subcommittee under the chairmanship of our good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN. I know that the statements about public spending, made by those who have preceded me, are sincere and from the heart. I could not help but think, however, that now that we have all of these problems facing us, how much worse off we would have been had it not been for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] who in earlier times has stood here and fought to see that we, in the stress of circumstances or agitation, did not let our own country down.

As we consider this bill providing for our own country, I cannot help but think a little more about being here yesterday when this body voted by a vote of 234 to 141 for an appropriation of \$3.6 billion in foreign aid—over my opposition, may I say—practically all of which goes to foreign governments, and they in turn sell to their own people. I agree that today we need to put first things first, and we certainly need to hold down governmental spending. But I do not believe in cutting the necessary food to the same degree that you forgo a vacation. I do not believe that we can afford to let this country, with fewer people to work and with many, many problems, lack for attention to flood control and development because we are spending billions of dollars on less worthwhile activities.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S VETO

May I say again that in 1959 we faced this issue, and at that time, on the second try, we overrode President Eisenhower in his veto of the public works bill. We did that on my motion, with the support of the gentleman from Ohio.

The reason given at that time for vetoing the public works bill were that in view of our serious situation, in view of our commitments around the world and in view of our involvements, we could not afford 62 new starts to protect and develop our own country. In the argument on that motion, I used the President's own statement in presenting our case:

The very fact that we are involved around the world, the very fact that we have this war, the very fact that we have many obligations makes it imperative that we not let our country go to pot when we can protect it.

OHIO-LAKE ERIE PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, one of the major actions taken by the committee was to provide planning funds for the Ohio-Lake Erie project. This is a fine project with great value to a nation that is expected to have 340 million people by the year 2000. Not only is it important because it will join the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Ohio, but with the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway from the Tennessee River to the Gulf of Mexico we would have about two-thirds of an inland waterway from the Great Lakes to the gulf.

Our committee, in its report, made provision for the committee to initiate planning on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway from funds in this bill, as soon as we have a favorable report which we have urged the Corps of Engineers to expedite. I know of nothing that would be a greater lasting tribute to the work of MIKE KIRWAN than this great inland waterway.

TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE

Action on Tennessee-Tombigbee navigation: With regard to the Tennessee-Tombigbee navigation project, one of our major problems was the fact that in November 1964, the Bureau of the Budget suddenly changed the rules—after 140 years—and in determining the cost-benefit ratio refused to credit to navigation projects the potential benefits of the effect of water transportation on other freight costs. After we developed these facts during our hearings on public works this year—volume 3, pages 1274 to 1325—and after considerable delay, I am glad to say the Budget Bureau returned to the original formula, where such effects are counted in the cost-benefit ratio.

Subsequently, the Corps of Engineers was unable to complete its reanalysis of the economic report in time for final action by the committee. The committee has therefore provided the language in the report which should gain us a year's time. The language is as follows:

The Committee has had to defer action to provide funds in the bill for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway pending completion of the current economic re-analysis being conducted by the Corps of Engineers. The Committee urges that the study report be made available at an early date and has approved the use of such additional funds as may be necessary to expedite its completion. Upon

the availability of the final report for review and approval, the Committee wishes to point out that it would then be in a position to allocate available funds in the bill to resume planning of the project during the current fiscal year.

Approximately 253 miles in length, the Tennessee-Tombigbee would provide a major link in water transportation from Lake Erie to the Gulf of Mexico. It would be immensely valuable for the future growth in national population, with the resulting increase of industry and need for transportation facilities. Low-cost water transportation is so vital to the industries most basic to economic growth: petroleum, steel, coal, chemicals, electric power, and food products, for example.

Under leave to extend my remarks I shall go into further detail as to merits of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway and its relationship to the Ohio-Lake Erie project.

I have a high regard for persons in the Bureau of the Budget, but in the years I have been here they have, on occasion, yielded to political pressure, or at least so it seemed. At any rate, it would be a serious mistake to leave final decision to the Bureau of the Budget, anonymous people whom you cannot find, especially when we see them recommend to the President that he make major cuts in funds for REA, school lunch, soil conservation, and other programs of the Department of Agriculture—as they did this year. We restored funds for these programs, as we should have done, but I say it would be a serious mistake to let our country go to pot under present conditions.

None of us on this committee has a personal interest here. We wrote this bill at the instance of our colleagues, as the spokesmen for people in areas who know what the needs are, with due consideration for the Bureau of the Budget. I hope, my friends, we will stay with the committee as they proceed with consideration of this bill.

CONGRESS EXERCISES ITS OWN JUDGMENT

Our committee heard testimony from 180 of our 435 colleagues in support of projects, most of which were recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, though their submissions differed somewhat in detail from those of officials of the Budget Bureau.

Though we have modified budget recommendations, in the overall we have reduced the budgeted amount by more than \$50 million. At the same time we have authorized 29 new starts in planning and 23 new starts in construction. In addition we have made many restorations in areas where we felt the budget was not putting first things first. We have made every effort to take care of the needs of this Nation within reasonable limits. After all we spend in this bill for public works only about one-fourth of what we spend trying to get a man to the moon.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Since my colleagues have covered the general provisions of this bill, I shall discuss the Mississippi River and tributaries and other projects in my general area in more detail. Insofar as the Mid-

south is concerned, we have restored the \$7,850,000 cut from funds available this year for the Mississippi River and tributaries. Thus, our action will provide the same money for next year that we have had this year. We must remember that the Mississippi must take the brunt of the flood problems of the entire Missouri Basin, the Ohio Basin, plus the upper Missouri Basin and others. The Mississippi River simply will not wait. If we are to handle the flood problems of the area, we must keep current in meeting them; otherwise, you may create a dangerous situation, and in the long run it would prove to be far more expensive.

CROWDER, PADUCAH WELLS AND UPPER CHANNEL

Within the funds available, we have provided \$50,000 for the upper auxiliary channels, \$75,000 for planning road crossings of the Panola-Quitman Floodway at Crowder and at Paducah Wells, and \$10,000 for planning on the Ascalmore-Tippo Bayou project. Our committee in its report states: "It expects that the requirements of local cooperation on the Big Sunflower River project shall be the same as those required in the St. Francis and Yazoo Basins, pursuant to the 1946 Flood Control Act."

RESERVOIRS

The bill provides further for expediting work on Gin and Muddy Bayous by \$100,000. The bill carries funds for the development of recreation facilities at Sardis, Enid, Arkabutla, and Grenada Reservoirs; and may I say here I appreciate the support of my committee in getting the Corps of Engineers to retract their earlier decision to charge for the use of these reservoirs where no special services are provided. It is my understanding charges are being made at three points, however, and the matter as to whether these three come within the intent of the act is under study by the legislative committee.

This restoration of funds includes items I have mentioned and in addition will more adequately take care of Mississippi levees, channel improvements, the Memphis Harbor project, the west Tennessee tributaries, the Yazoo Basin, and other points in this area.

WATERSHEDS

Mr. Chairman, the counties of Alcorn, Itawamba, Lee, Pontotoc, Prentiss, and Tishomingo, have recently been added to my district. This is an area with which I am very familiar, having many ties there and having represented the adjacent counties of Tippah and Union through the years.

For this area, our subcommittee increased funds for the Tennessee-Tombigbee watershed by \$100,000 to expedite work, making a total of \$850,000 available. This is of special value to Twenty Mile Creek and to Itawamba County. Other watersheds come under my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture. These include the Tuscumbia watershed in Alcorn County, the Chiswapa Creek, the Chuquathatchee, the Lappatubby and the Upper Skuna watersheds in Pontotoc County, the Town Creek and the Chiswapa in Lee County, and the Tuscumbia watershed in Prentiss County.

In Itawamba and Tishomingo the problems are being met by projects mentioned. These are in addition to those in my original district.

HATCHIE RIVER

We have provided \$60,000 for the corps to carry on its share of the planning work with the Soil Conservation Service on the Hatchie River in Mississippi and Tennessee.

YELLOW CREEK

We have provided funds to initiate construction of the Bear Creek project and have urged the TVA to "continue its cooperative tributary area development program in the Yellow Creek area and to provide all technical assistance possible to the Yellow Creek Watershed Authority, including agricultural resource development, forest management, industrial site management, and development, recreation, and cooperative planning of port facilities near the mouth of Yellow Creek."

REA

Mr. Chairman, our Appropriations Committee also followed the course we have followed here in handling the appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture.

In the bill my subcommittee and Senator HOLLAND's subcommittee, in addition to restoring certain programs, agreed on increasing authority for crop production loans by \$50 million and for rural electrification and telephone loans by \$187 million. This is authority to make loans which will be repaid with interest. With the shortage of labor, the increasing need for electric power as a replacement, and the need for increased food production to offset inflation, these loan funds are believed to be highly necessary.

We more than made up for these increases by reducing other funds, leaving a total of \$28.5 million below the budget request.

The President signed that bill into law, though according to newspaper accounts, he objected to a provision in the bill that "would automatically bar American food aid to any country engaged in trade or shipping with North Vietnam."

Here, as there, Mr. Speaker, the committee has put the protection and development of our own country first, for it is the base upon which all the rest must stand.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit further detail from the Corps of Engineers on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway:

TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, ALA. AND MISS.

Summarized financial data

Total estimated Federal cost—	\$263,000,000
Appropriations to date—	1,129,000
Balance to complete—	261,871,000
Amount that could be utilized in fiscal year 1967—	1,000,000

¹ See the following:

Preconstruction planning—	\$184,000
Detailed design—	316,000

Complete planning— 500,000

Authorization: 1946 River and Harbor Act.
Location and Description: The project is located in west central Alabama and northeastern Mississippi, in Marengo, Sumter,

Greene and Pickens Counties, Alabama and Noxubee, Lowndes, Clay, Monroe, Itawamba, Prentiss and Tishomingo Counties, Mississippi. The project consists of a 253 mile long waterway for navigation connecting the Tennessee River at mile 215 (Pickwick Pool) with the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway at Demopolis, Alabama, 217 miles above Mobile by means of 10 locks, 5 dams and a deep cut through the dividing ridge between the two river systems.

Proposed Operations: If the economic reanalysis indicates a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio for the project, the amount of \$1,000,000 could be used to initiate project construction.

Justification: The Tennessee-Tombigbee project would provide a shorter, more direct connecting waterway between the eastern Gulf Coast and the Tennessee, Ohio and upper Mississippi River valleys. The lowering of production and marketing costs resulting from this shorter and less expensive transportation route would benefit a major segment of the nation's population. The five reservoirs created by the project would provide significant recreation benefits to the area. Thirty-eight counties within commuting distance of the project area have been designated for assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (PL 89-136 approved August 26, 1965). Project construction and operation would afford employment opportunities in the area. An economic reevaluation is expected to be completed by February, 1967.

THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY

Mr. Chairman, throughout history, man has strived to devise a shorter and quicker method and an alternate way of doing things. The idea of another way has always presented a challenge to man's thinking and a test of his ingenuity. The field of water transportation has been no exception.

A navigation project which has stirred the imagination of men for more than 150 years is the connection of the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers. This new waterway, which is the major missing link in the 10,000 mile inland waterways of the midcontinent would provide a shorter route to the eastern gulf, and would open up a vast area to accelerated economic and industrial growth. The proposed route for the waterway will also provide a tremendous fish and wildlife refuge plus providing outstanding potential for recreational development.

Frontiersmen of the Tennessee Valley had the dream of a connecting link between the two rivers in the early 1800's, and the idea has been kept alive through the years by determined citizens who believed that a water connection between the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers would provide the missing link in the great waterways of the Eastern, Middle-Western and Southern United States.

The proposed 253-mile Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is one of the most fascinating projects ever considered by the Army Engineers for construction. It is a big, bold, exciting venture that stimulates the imagination of men. This is true for two reasons: because of what it will accomplish and because of what it will involve to construct the waterway.

The proposed waterways presents another challenge to a nation which is being revolutionized by use of nuclear energy. It presents the challenge of an engineering feat because Tennessee-

Tombigbee could be a pilot project in the use of nuclear energy in the excavation of the land divide between the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers.

While the use of nuclear energy in the construction of the waterway might be considered not feasible economically, the "divide cut" of the Tenn-Tom could serve as a pilot project for the proposed new Panama Canal. No project has been found yet that can surpass Tennessee-Tombigbee in this and most nuclear scientists concede that such is a necessity.

By connecting the north-flowing Tennessee River near Pickwick Landing, Tenn., with the south-flowing Warrior-Tombigbee system at Demopolis, Ala., the waterway would link mid-America's 10,000-mile-plus inland waterway system with the southeastern gulf area and bring sea and foreign markets as much as 700 miles closer to much of the Nation's heartland.

It would connect the Mississippi, Illinois, Missouri, Ohio, Cumberland, and Tennessee Rivers into a navigable system that would rival any of the highly developed European systems of canals. It would also provide a link to the proposed Ohio River-Lake Erie Canal.

With our Nation's most important space and defense installations in the Tennessee-Tombigbee area—Redstone Arsenal in Alabama, Cape Kennedy in Florida, the NASA test site in Mississippi, and the space center in Houston—the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway would provide, not only an alternate route for the transportation of space and defense vehicles, but would bring them to their destinations much faster.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway would make possible a more economically feasible method of low-cost transportation for agricultural and mineral resources in the States adjoining the waterway and those in the "fringe" and tributary areas. It would provide industrial sites for manufacturers who need an abundance of water. These new industries would provide thousands of jobs to people who can no longer make a living in agriculture.

The waterway would provide an alternate route to the Mississippi system in case of disaster, low water, lock failure, floods, and other similar emergencies.

DESCRIPTION

To connect the Tennessee River and the Warrior-Tombigbee system would involve making over a large portion of the Tombigbee River and then creating an almost entirely new waterway connecting it to the Tennessee. The proposed waterway, when completed, would be 253 miles in length.

A series of locks and dams would overcome the difference in elevation from 70 feet at the Demopolis pool on the Warrior to 412 feet at the Pickwick pool on the Tennessee or a difference in elevation of 342 feet.

Specifically, the job of building the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway could involve improving 170 miles of existing river channel, building 45 miles of canal, constructing 5 dams and 10 locks, and making a 27-mile-long cut through the

dividing ridge between the Tennessee and Tombigbee watersheds. It would include the excavation of 112 million cubic yards of material in the divide cut alone and an additional 55 million cubic yards of material in the river and canal sections.

The waterway is authorized to be 170 feet wide and 9 feet deep, but indications are it likely will be between 250 and 300 feet wide. Consideration is being given this extra width in the present restudy being conducted by the Corps of Engineers. In the divide cut, the channel is proposed to have a depth of 12 feet and a width of 150 feet. Passing places 240 feet wide will be provided at intervals in the canal and divide sections.

The waterway will be divided into three sections:

First. The river section from Demopolis, Ala., north to Aberdeen, Miss., with locks and dams at Gainesville and Aliceville, Columbus and Aberdeen, Miss., a distance of 162 miles.

Second. The canal section consisting of a hillside lateral canal from Amory, Miss., to Bay Springs, Miss., with five locks from an elevation of 190 feet at the Aberdeen Dam pool to 330 feet at Bay Springs for a distance of 45 miles. This canal section would bypass numerous sharp bends of the east fork of the Tombigbee River and Mackeys Creek. It will be constructed by excavations and by building levees on one of its banks, while the hill would serve as a bank on the other side.

Third. The divide cut section from Bay Springs, Miss. to the Pickwick pool on the Tennessee River with an 84-foot lift lock and dam at Bay Springs to lift traffic from 330 feet to the 412-foot elevation of the Pickwick pool.

In order to cross the divide ridge it will be necessary to excavate 90 million cubic yards of earth requiring a minimum centerline cut of 175 feet, and it will be about 1,000 feet wide at the top. The cut will have a minimum depth of 75 feet for 5 miles. The elevation of the dividing ridge is 562 feet above mean sea level.

Army Engineers, in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission, are studying the possibilities of excavating the divide cut section by "nuclear cratering," the setting off of a string of small nuclear explosives deep underground, causing the topsoil to collapse, in the free world's first such use of nuclear energy.

Preliminary reports show that the use of nuclear energy in the "divide cut" will not be determined economically feasible but its use will be feasible from an engineering point of view. This site is still considered by many authorities the best possible potential pilot project for the proposed transisthmian canal which has been recommended by President Johnson for construction in the very near future.

Cost estimates of building a new transisthmian canal range from \$2½ billion and up by conventional methods but only \$800 million by using nuclear devices.

Each dam on the waterway will raise the waterway an average of 30 feet, ex-

cept at the northernmost site at Bay Springs where an 84-foot lift will be required to carry the waterway over the divide and into the Tennessee River. Locks will be of standard dimensions, 100 feet wide and 600 feet long, a size sufficient to permit most barge tows to pass in a single locking.

The river section between Demopolis, Ala., and Aberdeen, Miss., will be shortened by 21 cutoffs reducing the present river length by 31 miles.

Construction of the waterway, by conventional means, will take about 8 years and will begin on the southernmost section with first work scheduled on the 36-foot lock installation at Gainesville, Ala. At Demopolis, at the confluence of the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers, there is a lock and dam, which was completed in 1956, and it is now in operation. The Tombigbee River is navigable from Demopolis to the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile.

The locks are being so designed that they are 13 feet over the miter sill which would allow the construction of a 12-foot-deep channel rather than a 9-foot channel as authorized. It is believed that when the waterway is built it will be of this depth.

The waterway is planned for future enlargement so as to accommodate larger tows of deeper draft including perhaps shallow-draft seagoing vessels.

All work will be supervised by the Corps of Engineers with the Mobile District, South Atlantic Division, in charge of the river section and the Nashville district, Ohio River division, in charge of the lateral canal and divide cut sections.

In a study completed in June 1960, the cost of the waterway was estimated to be \$281 million, and it is estimated to be about \$300 million at the present time, because of rising construction costs. However, the new cost figure would provide a wider and better waterway than the one proposed in the 1960 study. Alabama and Mississippi would be required to finance about \$18 million of the total cost for the relocation of roads and bridges over the waterway with Mississippi bearing more than two-thirds the required costs.

Currently there are no plans for the production of hydroelectric power on the waterway.

BENEFITS

The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway will provide benefits that would enrich and create industrial growth throughout a large part of the Nation. It will give low-cost water transportation to commerce that flows from the interior of the Nation to the gulf and points in between. It would serve as an alternate route to the Mississippi River in case of emergencies, floods and disasters. It would move the Nation's space and defense vehicles to their destinations faster. It would open up large new areas for recreational pursuits. The waterway would quicken the pulse of a throbbing nation on the move.

The Corps of Engineers has determined that 23 States will share in the navigational benefits, with at least 55 percent of the economic returns accruing to States other than Alabama, Mis-

issippi, and Tennessee, thus establishing the project's national impact.

Annual commerce, as estimated by the Corps of Engineers, is fixed at 12,481,000 tons, which will move over the waterway at a savings of \$13,484,000.

The waterway would connect the southeastern gulf and the midcontinent river systems. It would bring Tennessee River ports upstream from Pickwick more than 800 miles closer to salt water ports. Nashville and Cumberland River ports would be almost 400 miles closer to seaports.

Noted economists have said that the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway will attract many new, heavy-type industries to locate along its course. The increased commerce and easier availability of raw materials would provide an outlet to the sea for finished products and would speed industrial development along the Tennessee River as well as parts of the Ohio, Cumberland, and Green Rivers and other water courses in Kentucky.

The waterway would be a favorable factor in helping to correct the Nation's unfavorable balance of payments.

This industrial growth resulting from the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee will be from new capital investment-type heavy industries which would not exploit other areas by pirating their plants. The manufacturers drawn to the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway today would add to the overall industrial expansion of all America. A clear example of industrial growth along navigable streams is in Alabama during a recent 6-year period, 75 percent of industries locating in the State have chosen sites on or near navigable streams.

The project would enhance the regional economy by encouraging the stepped-up exchange of commerce, thus promoting the Nation's expansion program and putting more money into circulation, thereby aiding underdeveloped sections, including the lower portion of the hard-hit Appalachian region.

In addition to industry, the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway could bring enormous benefits to the agricultural interest of the area. It would mean lower transportation costs for raw materials used in agriculture and provide a stimulus for the lagging agricultural economy in the proposed tributary area.

Phosphate used extensively in fertilizers comes mainly from Florida which produces three-fourths of the Nation's output through vast deposits in central Florida near Bartow, located about 40 miles east of the port of Tampa. This phosphate could move in bulk into Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee if the low-cost transportation that Tennessee-Tombigbee could provide were available.

In an area where the beef industry potential is unlimited, the waterway could provide a boost for cattle growers. Grain in bulk could be shipped at very low rates from the Midwest into Alabama and Mississippi to "top out" feeder cattle that are currently being bought by Midwestern cattlemen and transported to the Midwest. The cattle are then topped out, slaughtered, and much

of the meat is shipped back into the South for sale at a higher cost to the consumer.

Doane Agricultural Services of St. Louis conducted a recent survey which showed that more than 900,000 tons of grain will move into 42 counties adjacent to the waterway in Alabama each year for consumption by the livestock and poultry industries.

In an area rich in untapped mineral resources, a lowcost mode of transportation as provided by the Tennessee-Tombigbee could open vast new field of economic endeavor. Geologists believe the waterway will bring the fuller development of many valuable mineral resources, including tripoli, high-calcium limestone, bentonite, bauxite, expandable shale, aggregate, various clays, asphalt, gravel, copper, zinc, and iron ores in addition to coal, by making them more competitive on the open market as the direct result of cheap water transportation. Many of these minerals are now imported and some from overseas.

Such basic chemicals as sulfur, industrial salt, petroleum, and petroleum products, largely produced along the gulf coast could be shipped into the industrial complexes in the Tennessee, Ohio, and upper Mississippi Valley on the Tennessee-Tombigbee.

The oil and chemical industry, which relies heavily on barge transportation, is in strong support of the waterway as an incentive to regional development and economic growth. Standard Oil which has in operation a 100,000 barrel-a-day refinery at Pascagoula, Miss., has a market area coinciding with the direct tributary area of the Tennessee-Tombigbee.

Other potential shipments include sand, gravel, crushed limestone, pulpwood, logs, and iron and steel products.

The waterway could revitalize the east Tennessee and Alabama coal industries allowing the export of Tennessee Valley coking coal through the port of Mobile. Coal could move out of these two States at a rate of 2 million tons per year for export to foreign steel mills, probably Japan, because Mobile is 1 full day closer by freighter to the Panama Canal. This means the shipper could save about \$1,600 per freighter. Several million tons of western Kentucky coal now moving down the Mississippi for use in steam electric generating plants on the eastern gulf would move on the Tennessee-Tombigbee at a savings.

The gulf coast suffers from a lack of good construction type sand and gravel. Vast deposits of good sand and gravel are found near the Tombigbee River in northeast Mississippi and Tennessee River in north Alabama and could move along the river and to the gulf coast if the waterway were constructed.

North Alabama has millions and millions of tons of limestone that could move to the gulf coast for use as riprap, crushed aggregate for construction, building stone and many other uses.

Construction of the waterway could push this country closer to a landing on the moon in the accelerated space program. The Saturn missile would be 1,200 miles closer to its launching pad at

Cape Kennedy from the giant NASA facility in Huntsville, Ala. The waterway could directly connect the Nation's four most important space installations in Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, and Texas. The booster rockets built in Huntsville are now transported 2,200 miles down the Tennessee, Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers to the Gulf of Mexico and around Florida to Cape Kennedy. The Tennessee-Tombigbee could save money as well as about 2 weeks time in the space program.

Jet fuel, now carried overland, could be shipped much more economically by the waterway to Columbus Air Force Base and Meridian Naval Air Station in Mississippi.

The great nuclear energy installations, such as Oak Ridge, Tenn., could have closer access to the sea.

The pools created by the dams on the waterway would greatly increase all water sports in the Tennessee-Tombigbee area. It would provide a safe, slack-water route for small craft and privately owned pleasure vessels between Florida and the Tennessee, Cumberland, and Ohio Rivers at greatly reduced mileage. The trip up the Mississippi River is hazardous at certain times of the year for pleasure craft due to swift currents, flooding, floating debris, and ice in the upper areas of the river.

Fishing would be a year-round activity and waterfowl hunting more rewarding especially since the waterway is expected to create a new flyway for ducks migrating south.

Not to be overlooked are the many other recreational opportunities such as water skiing, speed boating, and just plain picnicking.

THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY AND THE LAKE ERIE-OHIO RIVER WATERWAY AS MUTUALLY SUPPORTIVE PROJECTS

The Lake Erie-Ohio River Waterway, as a public works undertaking, is strikingly similar to the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway in a number of respects. Considerations which justify the one tend very strongly, therefore, toward justification of the other.

Both of these waterways are connecting links between established navigation systems. Both of them join with the Ohio River system, the Tennessee-Tombigbee on the Tennessee River, a tributary of the Ohio, and the Lake Erie-Ohio River project on the upper main stream of the Ohio. Both of them connect inland communities with deepwater ports, the Tennessee-Tombigbee with Mobile, and the Lake Erie-Ohio River project with Fairport Harbor and the port of Cleveland. As connecting links, both of these waterways will cross continental divides between separate drainage basins and possess, therefore, common engineering and design features. Thus, the justification of either of these two waterways establishes an initial presumption favoring justification of the other.

The two waterways are, in fact, segments of a common long-haul waterway system and might well be conceived as twin features of a single program. Their completion will establish an unbroken waterway connection between Lake Erie and the Gulf of Mexico. Shipment in a

single vessel, without rehandling of cargo, will then become possible for the entire distance between Cleveland, Ohio, and Mobile, Ala., or for any segment of this distance. In addition, the Tennessee-Tombigbee will connect Mobile directly with the upstream Mississippi River system, and the Lake Erie-Ohio River Waterway will unite Cleveland and northeast Ohio similarly into the upper Mississippi.

The congressional approval of one of these two waterways will strengthen the position of the other. Eighty percent of the cross-continental waterway between Cleveland, Ohio, and Mobile, Ala., is already in existence—the Ohio, Tennessee, and Tombigbee Rivers. Only the two links are missing. Decisive action toward completion of either one of these two projects will leave the remaining one as the sole missing link. The argument to close a single remaining gap in the cross-continental system is more compelling than an argument to close one of two remaining gaps.

The vital appeal of either of these waterways is its role in a more extensive waterway system. Both of them depend for justification on large volumes of traffic originating or terminating, or both, on connecting waterways. The completion of either of these two waterways adds greatly to the territorial extent and number of shipping and receiving points which might be served by the other. Thus, completion of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Waterway would introduce the potential movement via the Tennessee-Tombigbee notably of various mineral products between the Warrior-Tombigbee Basin and Lake Erie. This potential for the Tennessee-Tombigbee project would constitute an additional point in its favor. The converse argument may be offered for early completion of the Tennessee-Tombigbee.

It may be noted that the greater the distance of points which originate or terminate shipments which transit the Tennessee-Tombigbee from the actual location of this waterway, the less is it a local or purely regional project, and the more its benefits become nationally distributed. For example, shipments via the Tennessee-Tombigbee between Lake Erie and the gulf coast would endow far-distant communities with an interest in this waterway. For a project financed with Federal funds, the more broad the geographical distribution of the benefits over the extent of the Nation, the more is Federal financing justified.

For these reasons, the Tennessee-Tombigbee and the Lake Erie-Ohio River Waterway projects may be considered as entirely harmonious and mutually supportive. Action to advance either of these two lends strength to favorable action on the other.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, first let me again acknowledge my pleasure at the opportunity of serving on this subcommittee and express, of course, my gratitude to our chairman [Mr. KIRWAN] for the courtesies extended to me

as a junior member of the subcommittee, and also my appreciation to my other colleagues on either side of the subcommittee aisle for their cooperation.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, with certain exceptions to which I might address myself in a moment, I believe this to be a pretty good bill, responsibly considered and carefully prepared. As the report will show, and as has already been explained, it is true the bill contains funding for 24 unbudgeted new construction starts, funding for beginning 28 unbudgeted surveys, and for the initiation or planning of 29 unbudgeted projects. All of this is summarized on page 5 of the report, if those who just came into the room care to look at it.

In addition to these add-ons, it is true that we have also gone above the budget estimate on a number of budgeted items. In most cases, we have come up to, or close to what is called the "capability" of the Corps of Engineers for that particular project. Since these add-ons, and the additions to budgeted items that we agreed upon, have already been discussed, and since this is evidently to become the focal point for such opposition as there is to the bill, let us take a closer look at our action.

Again, for those who were not here earlier to listen to the previous speakers, let me point out that the bill itself, in calling for an appropriation of slightly over \$4.1 billion does represent—even with all these so-called "add-ons"—a reduction in the overall budget estimates of over \$56 million. Also, if it has not been mentioned before, the \$4.1 billion in the bill is over \$214 million less than the appropriations for all these same items for fiscal year 1966.

It is true—as our colleague [Mr. DAVIS], has charged—that we did make a reduction of approximately \$64 million in the budget estimate for the Atomic Energy Commission whose needs, as usual, represent by far the largest agency item in our bill. Since our net reduction—and I stress the word "net"—is only \$56 million, then we have indeed provided for about an \$8 million increase in excess of the budget estimates for the remaining agencies in the bill.

But, Mr. Chairman, even acknowledging, as I certainly do, the heavy responsibility this Congress is now under to get Federal spending under better control—and I agree this must be done—is it still necessary for us to always use only the President's budget estimates as our one and only guide?

Mr. Chairman, I for one believe that the answer to that has to be "no"—at least if this Congress, or any Congress, is to preserve its right to review and, if need be, to reassess the budgetary priorities as handed down to it by the Chief Executive and his Bureau of the Budget.

We have exercised that right and that responsibility earlier this year in connection, for instance, with the school lunch program, the special milk program, funds for land-grant colleges and what not. There may be other examples which may come to your mind, but I believe we should continue to protect that right and to exercise that responsibility, even

though it may put the President in a position where, if he wishes to, he can be critical of the Congress.

For, if our subcommittee—and then the Congress—were only to consider and approve budgeted items, and were always to hold to budget estimates, then it seems to me we would have accepted something like a one-sided "no new starts" policy, binding on Congress but not on the President, whereunder we would be totally subordinating our judgment of the Nation's needs in flood control and so forth to the President's judgment.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am sure the gentleman would not mind if at this point we were to point out the fact that the total bill, including appropriations for the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Atomic Energy Commission, is some \$56 million below the budget estimates and \$214 million below the appropriations for these activities for the past fiscal year.

Mr. ROBISON. I am glad the gentleman has again pointed out that fact.

Mr. Chairman, those of my colleagues who are here listening might assume, from what I had been saying, that I am the beneficiary, or that the people in my congressional district are the beneficiaries, of one of these unbudgeted "add-ons"—either a new survey or a planning or construction start. But that is not the case. And, while I might disagree with the relative priority of certain of the "add-on" items vis-a-vis the overall priorities of the tremendous job of water management we have in this country, a problem that gets worse as time goes by, I would have to say, as the report states on page 5, that I believe we did our best, given the conditions under which we had to operate, to make sure that all these "add-ons" were of a high, relative priority.

Let us consider, for instance, the new and unbudgeted construction start for the Chatfield Dam project in Colorado, mentioned earlier today. I doubt if I got more mail on all of the rest of the items in the bill than I did on this one project, all by itself, and the testimony I heard on it convinced me that it is an urgently needed project—needed now.

Or, as an example of an instance in which we increased a budgeted item, one was for a Potomac River project affecting Washington, D.C. The budgeted item for advance engineering and design on the so-called Bloomington Reservoir, was \$665,000, though the capability of the corps was \$1,265,000. When the subcommittee "marked up" this item there was great concern in this area, and great doubt as to whether or not the Potomac River would have sufficient water in it to supply the needs of the people of this metropolitan area. The subcommittee in its wisdom increased that figure to the full capability of the corps, as I believe we should have.

Another such item, of more parochial interest to me, was the budgeted item for beginning the so-called Northeast-

ern U.S. Water Supply Study. This was only \$76,000, which I thought this was ridiculously low, in view of the water resource problem faced by the citizens of this drought-ridden area of our Nation. The corps capability here again was \$325,000. Thanks to the action of the subcommittee, this item was increased to that amount, so that we can at least make a more reasonable beginning on this project.

Let me say in conclusion: Can this bill still be cut? Can it be cut in a responsible fashion? Should it be cut?

I believe the answers to all those questions are "yes." I believe that this bill should be cut by applying to it a somewhat modified version of what we have all come to know the Bow amendment, named after our friend from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. The form that that amendment might take in connection with this bill would be to direct a reduction of 5 percent across the board—and let me stress that "across the board" concept—on all the items or projects funded in this bill except, perhaps, the items in title III for the Atomic Energy Commission, which agency's budget already has been rather severely cut and which has such a relation to defense that I personally would question whether we ought to cut it further.

I believe this would be an entirely reasonable proposition for each and every one of us to accept; that it is in the national interest that this much of a slowdown or a stretchout in the Federal construction programs financed under this bill—in your district as well as in my district, and in all the districts of this Nation—be ordered.

Actually, when you consider that the President is now trying to find ways and means to make a 10-percent cut across the board in all domestic spending, a 5-percent cut here would seem to be too reasonable, although I doubt that we have the votes to hope to go any further than that.

It may be said in answer to this proposition that the bill has already been cut severely by the subcommittee by virtue of its having applied a little more than what we might call normal "slippage," a technical term which is more or less explained in the report. Actually, though, this was only a nominal addition to normal slippage, and available for us to take by virtue of the fact that we are already 2 or 3 months into the present fiscal year, so we knew what the carryovers were better than we usually do.

I think the subcommittee did a pretty good job in reducing this bill under normal circumstances, but I do not think we are operating under normal circumstances now. Nor has this bill been cut beyond the point of normal fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, in summary I think this bill should be cut further by the application of an amendment along lines I have suggested. I hope this committee will be given the opportunity to do it, and that it will vote to do so at the appropriate time.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few remaining thoughts on this measure that I

would now like to present for the committee's consideration.

As we know—with the exception of the funds for the Atomic Energy Commission, and even it is engaged in some useful research work in connection with the desalting of water—most of the other moneys in this bill will be used in some fashion, to promote the better utilization, control, or conservation of water which, as the Secretary of the Interior reminded us "is our most indispensable natural resource."

As Secretary Udall further said, it is certainly true, and tragically so, that:

We have been casual and careless about (water's) management and use (but) . . . there is a growing national awareness that our water supply cannot be taken for granted, and that we must take every feasible step to conserve and protect it.

Such a national awareness has, indeed, been overlong in coming, but it is here, and it is reflected in the work of our subcommittee as well as in the items contained in this bill.

But, Mr. Chairman, I venture to suggest that we have yet, as a government or as a people, to develop a firm and balanced, comprehensive national policy on water resources.

One of the reasons why this is so—probably the main reason—was suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], some weeks ago, when he inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and this appears on page 20730 of the RECORD for August 25 of this year, if you had not noticed it—a compilation prepared for him by the Library of Congress of the far too numerous Federal agencies, bureaus, and whatnot having some jurisdiction or responsibility over some part of our national problems with water.

As Mr. SAYLOR pointed out, the permanent Federal agencies having such jurisdiction or responsibility are no less than 27, scattered in 8 different Cabinet departments, plus 8 independent agencies with some responsibilities. In addition to this, there are three agencies operating within the Executive Office of the President exercising responsibility in the same field, making a grand total of 38 agencies each of which has some specific responsibility for some aspect of Federal water resource activity.

To this has to be added the work of a variety of temporary committees and commissions down through the years and, of course, the water resource interest and activity that is engaged in by Congress, itself.

As Congressman SAYLOR noted, it is little wonder that the water resource field insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, is "confusion compounded"—and this is why I believe it is so difficult to find that we have, yet, any sort of firm, balanced water resources policy.

Now, of course, the Water Resources Council—which is a Cabinet-level agency composed of the Secretaries of Agriculture; Army; Health, Education, and Welfare; and, Interior, as well as the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and which was established by the Water

Resources Planning Act of 1966—may well become the one group out of whose work such a national policy may develop.

Certainly, we can all hope so—for that policy is badly needed.

Let me give you at least one example of why: As you know, funds are included in this bill for such agencies as TVA, the Army Engineers, Bonneville Power Administration and, of course, the Atomic Energy Commission. All of these—and others as well—are engaged in some way with the development of waterpower facilities and projects for the production of electric energy except the AEC which, during our hearings, told us that the sources for the development of electrical energy by use of atomic power are steadily growing.

At that point in the hearings, I attempted to find out what—if anything—was being done at some higher level of Government to correlate these two potential sources of electrical power so that we on our subcommittee, at least, might know that we were not going beyond what the Nation would eventually need in waterpower projects for the production of electricity.

The answer I got was not very satisfactory beyond the fact that some sort of energy study was ordered a couple of years ago, and that the study has been a long time aborning because—to quote from the witness for the AEC: "It has been a very difficult thing to put together."

Until that study is picked up and completed—as I hope it will be—I would express the hope that those in charge of deciding whether or not to build hydro or atomic power sources with Federal moneys would more directly relate their activities, one to the other, than they now seem to be doing through some vague sort of informal "consultation" process. Mr. Chairman, I believe this to be essential if our Nation is to be developed in something other than a haphazard, and probably wasteful, manner.

In a different area of concern, I also believe the Congress should make a thorough review of the method by which we now determine the supposed benefit-cost ratios of the types of projects for which funds are provided in this bill, and especially for navigational or waterway projects with respect to which the Bureau of the Budget switched signals on us between the end of our hearings and the date of our delayed "markup."

For this, and other reasons, I do have reservations about the \$500,000 unbudgeted item added in "markup" to resume planning on the so-called Lake Erie-Ohio Canal project in Ohio and Pennsylvania. However, this project has a strong and convincing advocate in the person of our subcommittee chairman so that I assume it will survive any amendments offered against it, today, even as it survived subcommittee and full committee action. I would hope that next year we would take a closer look at this project and its economic justification.

I have reservations, too, about the \$800,000 we have allowed to continue planning on the so-called Dickey-Lincoln project, in Maine. As the report shows—

page 49—we are indicating here our intention to have a further staff study made of this project's merits before going on with it and I, personally, believe that this study should be made before we appropriate any more planning money for it, even if the staff's study casts further doubts on its justification, it is going to become increasingly difficult to stop it.

Finally, I also have reservations—and grave ones—about the \$3,200,000 item included in the TVA's budget for the so-called Tellico Dam and Reservoir, in Tennessee. This project attains only a very doubtful benefit-cost ratio without the use of the questionable device of including, as a benefit, the sum of nearly \$11 million to be obtained by TVA, at some remote time in the future, as the net proceeds from the sale of some additional acreage around this reservoir that it plans to acquire for eventual industrial development.

I think this is a questionable practice—though there is precedence for it in TVA's Melton Hill Reservoir project, where the device has yet to prove its true feasibility.

I cannot conclude without mentioning my regret that, once again, we have made no progress toward breaking that impasse which for years has stalled any further progress toward completing the Corps of Engineer's plans for developing the North Branch of the Susquehanna River above the Triple Cities area in the district I have the honor to represent.

However, there is money in this bill to move substantially forward on the corps' resurvey of the whole Susquehanna River Basin—the authorization for which stems from a resolution approved by the Committee of Public Works on my motion back when I served on that committee.

We can anticipate that, at sometime in the near future, the corps will be in a position to release at least an interim report on its work on this resurvey—and I hope that then we will have a chance for all concerned to take a new and objective look at the need for those upstream structures that were authorized on the Susquehanna many years ago but never yet built, and I have received the assurance of the chairman of our subcommittee that he will be most willing to do so during the hearings next year.

I trust we will be able to do this, for there is a renewed interest in our Susquehanna River—for which the outline of a river basin compact has been drafted, the same to be submitted to the legislatures of the three States involved—New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland—sometime next year.

Mr. Chairman, for the residents of this river basin the Susquehanna is a great natural resource, but one that has been sadly misused and abused. The hour is late, but there is still time to save this river of ours and to develop it to its full potential, not only for those privileged to live alongside it now but for those generations yet unborn who, some day, will have the opportunity to use and enjoy it as we have not been able to do.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the Committee on Appropriations and the distinguished and knowledgeable gentleman from Ohio, Representative MIKE KIRWAN, and the members of his subcommittee for the excellent report and bill appropriating funds for public works projects during fiscal year 1967.

The committee was faced with the difficult task of weighing today's public works needs against the resources available at this time. In its wisdom, the committee has brought out a bill which reduces public works funds below the level of the preceding year. I am sure that the committee, as well as others in this body, would prefer to see an increase in this type of investment for the future prosperity of our Nation. However, the great demands on our public funds for immediate defense efforts prevent the desired level of participation in needed public works developments.

I am particularly gratified by the manner which the Appropriations Committee, in its report, held open the funding of the important Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. The report notes that the committee, in the bill, had to defer action on the request to provide funds for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway pending completion of the current economic reanalysis being conducted by the Corps of Engineers.

The committee urges that the study report be made available at an early date and has approved the use of such additional funds as may be necessary to expedite its completion.

The committee points out that upon the availability of the final report for review and approval, it would be in a position to allocate available funds in the bill to resume planning of the project during the current fiscal year.

This favorable report by the committee is very good news to the 23 States which will share in the navigational benefits of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, a proposed 253-mile waterway connection to provide the vast midcontinent area with a shorter, more economical route to the eastern gulf and thence to developing foreign markets. Initiation of construction for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway will also be good news to the other 27 States. As the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has pointed out so well, you do not help 1 State without lifting the other 49.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway proposal has stirred the imagination of men for more than 150 years. It is more exciting today because of what it will accomplish in the way of accelerated economic and industrial growth, for the national defense and for improved recreation.

The 253-mile waterway is the major missing link in our 10,000-mile inland waterways. The proposal involves 170 miles of channel improvements and 45 miles of canal construction.

Congressional action for this waterway was first requested in 1810 by a

group of residents in Knox County, Tenn. Congress authorized study of the proposed waterway in 1874, 1913, 1923, and 1932. The Corps of Engineers approved the project in 1938. Congress authorized the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1946.

The project was deferred in 1952 but interest in this vital waterway continued.

The Public Works Appropriation Act of 1957 authorized another restudy of Tennessee-Tombigbee. This resulted in a favorable report from the engineers.

In 1964, the Bureau of the Budget recommended that the Corps of Engineers update the budget of the previous favorable report and funds were appropriated for a new study in the 1965 appropriations bill.

Additional funds for this study were appropriated last year and the report is now in the final stages of review by the corps. It is this review to which the Appropriations Committee referred in the report on H.R. 17787 which we have before us today.

The favorable reception of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway in the committee's report is a tribute to the insights and vision of the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. He personally inspected the route of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway in a weeklong tour in November 1965. The chairman noted that the Tennessee-Tombigbee project must be constructed for the continued growth of America. He looks ahead to a truly great America of tomorrow. He is one of the real builders of a better America.

Supporters of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway are pleased to have the endorsement of the Appropriations Committee for the missing link in the Nation's midcontinent waterways system.

We are gratified by the report from the committee and look forward with great anticipation to the favorable study report by the Corps of Engineers.

This important project has been too long delayed and the whole Nation has been the loser for the delay in construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I had not intended to speak on the overall provisions of this bill, because I think the measure has been rather fully covered by the distinguished chairman of our committee and others. I would like to associate myself with the members of the majority of our committee who support this bill in its entirety without reduction or without being cut. I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Chairman KIRWAN, for his patience and his diligence and his great work. We think this is a good bill. We think this bill represents an investment in America.

Mr. Chairman, let me also commend to my colleagues of the House our committee report, which is a most extensive report, and which will answer all or

most of the questions that you may have on this bill. There are nine members of our subcommittee, and I believe that we are almost unanimous, with perhaps one or two exceptions, in urging the House to support the committee bill and to support the committee report. By way of comparison, in summary, as was pointed out, it is much less than the foreign aid bill that the House passed yesterday, which does not have any critical benefit-cost ratio established at all. It is much less than the NASA bill for our space exploration program, which annually soars to approximately \$5 billion annually. Again I say that this bill represents an investment in America. It carries an appropriation of \$4,110,942,000. This is a reduction of \$214.5 million from fiscal year 1966. So we have cut this bill already by more than \$214.5 million. It is \$56 million less than the budget recommended. Now, you may say how can you do that and have it less than the budget recommended and still have new starts. The committee exercised its own judgment and did what we thought was right. We did not let the people downtown or the Bureau of the Budget write the ticket for us. We have added some items which we thought were of a higher priority and we have cut and reduced others which we did not think were of such high priority. This is a committee bill and represents our collective judgment. There are three volumes of hearings on the table here having some 4,000 pages of testimony, with several thousand witnesses. There were 100 Members of Congress who appeared before our subcommittee recommending that items be included in this bill. We did add 24 unbudgeted new construction starts. As has been pointed out by the chairman earlier, all of these projects, with one exception, are small. The new starts are small in amount of money and will be funded over a long period of years. In other words, the projects approved are small in amounts of funds needed. We have approved 28 unbudgeted planning starts. Now, why should we not plan before the Vietnam crisis is over? We should plan to have these projects ready to move into construction so at the time when they are needed we will have them available. We approved some 28 surveys and there were requests for hundreds of surveys to be made. Surely we can provide for surveys throughout this great country of ours this year.

The Panama Canal proposal has not been discussed here today. This survey calls for a sea-level canal. This bill carries \$4 million for this study together with the work which the Atomic Energy Commission in its "plowshare" proposal will perform on this matter to see if it cannot be built at a reduced cost.

Mr. Chairman, there is the total of \$2 million in carryover funds. So, the Corps of Engineers will have some \$6 million for the sea-level canal study by the Panama Canal Commission.

While we will discuss today the Ohio-Lake Erie Canal project—included in this bill—I look forward to the time when our committee can and will provide sub-

stantial appropriations to begin construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal which will contribute greatly to the inland waterway system of America.

We are providing some funds for planning in the bill we are discussing today but this project—I repeat—eventually will contribute greatly to the inland waterway system of our Nation.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I state to the Committee that we should not cut this bill and I urge that all members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union support the committee.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been earlier made to recreational expenditure. However, permit me to point out that wherever there are recreational appropriations carried in this bill they are designed to be applied on a local matching contributory basis and for reimbursement. They are, in effect, IO U's.

In other words, we have contracted with the cities and others to reimburse this expenditure upon this basis for which we are proposing appropriations therefor.

Mr. Chairman, the authorizing legislative committee, again, has said that we have reduced this by \$56 million below the budget.

Mr. Chairman, we urge the support of all members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman and the members of the committee, as well as the full Committee on Appropriations, for the statesmanlike approach which they have taken to the problem of water resource development in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to commend them for not simply rubberstamping the Bureau of the Budget decisions downtown. I believe the Committee on Appropriations has done the right thing in making these decisions with independence in this legislative field. They have cut the budget substantially while recognizing merit in some projects which for one reason or another did not win administration backing.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the committee has done an outstanding job and I wholeheartedly support this bill.

The funds which are provided today for continuing the Arkansas River development program are more important to the economic growth and health of the Ozarks region than any possible poverty program or regional economic legislation.

This is the bill that assures for millions of Americans along the Arkansas River an equal break in the competitive age in which we now live.

With navigation, control of flood water, and abundant water storage—all essential parts of this great program—the people of the Arkansas River Basin can see the industrial development and job opportunities that have marked the Ohio,

the Tennessee, the Columbia, and the other great river basins of America.

Congressman MIKE KIRWAN, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill, will rank forever as one of the great builders of America, through the statesmanship and foresight which he has brought to water development.

For people who will be served by the new Shidler Reservoir, for which planning money is provided in this bill, the legislation means the difference between growth and progress in the future, or indefinite stalemate due to a chronic water problem.

This program not only means an estimated 5,000 jobs for workmen engaged in construction, but tens of thousands of jobs of a permanent nature in the years ahead.

I wholeheartedly support the committee bill, and urge its approval.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his remarks.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Of course I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I think that the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has come out again, with a typically fine bill, balancing the needs of our Nation against the avoidance of unnecessary public expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, I would like particularly to publicly express the respect I have for the chairman of that subcommittee for his wisdom and vision based upon my observations during the 2 years in which I have come to know him in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, flood damages prevented by the Corps of Engineers projects has reached a new high of \$1.5 billion during fiscal year 1965. The committee estimates that over the years the accumulative flood damages prevented by all corps projects already exceeds \$14 billion.

That much remains to be done is undeniable. Last year, Riverside County in California was hit by heavy rains and resulting flood damage was high. In fact, the county was declared a national disaster area. The city of Palm Springs was particularly hard hit.

In this bill today is a \$100,000 planning grant for the Tahquitz Creek flood control project in and around the city of Palm Springs. This project, when completed, will alleviate many of the fears of Palm Springs residents about future floods.

I want to thank the members of the House Appropriations Committee for their foresight in approving funds so that the Tahquitz project can begin. I hope that the House will approve this bill today.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Of course I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Chairman, as a result of a power failure out in Nebraska, general interest has developed in a 345-kilovolt powerline from Fort Thompson, S. Dak., to Grand Island, Nebr.

Mr. Chairman, this request was made after the committee had held hearings. However, I had discussed and talked with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] about this project.

I would now like to ask the gentleman if it might be possible for us to consider this powerline in the supplemental appropriation bill later, after this bill is passed.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CALLAN] has spoken to me and to other members of the committee about this project. However, the request came after the hearings of the committee were closed.

However, there is a substantial appropriation requested. It has not been budgeted. Therefore, it has not been possible to consider it. However, if the request is seasonally presented, I am sure the Committee on Appropriations would be pleased to entertain the request.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to highly commend the members of the Committee on Appropriations for their excellent work.

Mr. Chairman, I highly commend our valued friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, and the members of his committee for their dedication and thorough manner in conducting the hearings prior to reporting H.R. 17787. Therefore, I rise to enthusiastically support this measure exactly as reported by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I equally oppose the amendments which Mr. DAVIS has announced that he will offer.

For example, in one of his amendments he proposes to delete several new construction projects which have been approved by the full Committee on Appropriations and are included under the provisions of H.R. 17787. This list includes the R. D. Bailey Reservoir, which is located on the Guyandot River in Wyoming County in the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia. The committee has recommended an expenditure of \$800,000 in order that construction may be started during fiscal year 1967 for this vitally needed flood control protection project. The ultimate cost of the R. D. Bailey Reservoir is estimated to be \$82,600,000.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that this project has been found qualified in every respect and it does have a favorable benefit-cost ratio. It would appear to me that the R. D. Bailey Reservoir which, when completed, will afford adequate flood protection in an area of 117 square miles in the entire Guyandot River Basin and other justified projects should be constructed at the earliest possible moment. The residents in this and similar areas who have been plagued by constant flood losses are deserving of this flood protection.

Therefore, I strongly recommend that H.R. 17787 be approved as recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

Thank you.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the public works appropriations bill before us today does not include the \$250,000 requested by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] to reopen the Beverly National Cemetery in New Jersey and to keep open four national cemeteries now scheduled to be closed in fiscal year 1967. It is shocking to realize that brave young Americans who have sacrificed their lives for their country in Vietnam are now being denied the right of burial among their comrades in our national cemeteries. I hope it will still be possible to amend the bill to include these urgently needed funds. This is the final honor and tribute a grateful Nation owes to our fallen servicemen who have defended our security and the cause of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the members of the Appropriations Committee for their painstaking efforts which are evident in the report of the public works appropriation bill of 1967. The committee has succeeded in cutting through much of the fat of the administration's requests with the result that over \$65 million has been trimmed from the 1967 budget estimates. At a time when this country is faced with growing inflation, it is important that the Congress face its responsibility in eliminating all unnecessary Federal spending.

The committee should be especially commended for its work in the field of flood control. The report notes that control projects of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation prevented flood damage estimated at more than \$2.3 billion in 1965. Over the years corps projects alone have prevented more than \$14 billion in flood damages, which is more than twice the amount of money allocated for flood control. The long-range economy of these projects is most gratifying.

I am pleased to note that this bill includes \$150,000 for comprehensive planning purposes for the Minnesota River Valley. This valley covers nearly 17,000 square miles of which 14,000 are in Minnesota with the rest in South Dakota.

and Iowa. There are 206 incorporated municipalities in Minnesota within the river's watershed. The area is inhabited by almost half the population of the State, and some of the best farmland is found there. The area has tremendous untapped potential from both economic and recreation standpoints. As the scope of this potential became evident to the residents of southern Minnesota, the State legislature was contacted for assistance and counsel. The Minnesota River Valley Development Interim Commission, in cooperation with the legislative research committee submitted a report to the legislature in January 1965. The report expressed the desire of interested individuals and the interim commission to assist in and cooperate with a basin study to arrive at the best use of all resources of the area. This local initiative is commendable. However, to fully comprehend the scope of the organizational difficulties involved in a project of this sort, it is necessary to remember that over 20 Federal agencies, about 30 State agencies, private agencies, and many organizations and groups, and the utilities and news media are all involved in one way or another.

When the magnitude of the proposals became known, it was decided to contact the Federal Government for advice and assistance. After being in contact with several local citizens and groups, I presented a statement on April 30, 1964, before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works in support of a request for funds for a comprehensive survey of the Minnesota River Valley. Prior to that time there had been broad and general authority for such a study in the form of a House Public Works Committee resolution adopted in May of 1962, which requested a review of previous findings of the Chief of Engineers. In 1964, I asked that former studies be updated with a view to determining the advisability of further improvements in the Basin for navigation, flood control, recreation, and other related land and water resources. In that statement I pointed out that in order to avoid waste and duplication of effort it is necessary that a basic overall study be made. The subcommittee, and subsequently the Congress, granted the requested \$50,000 for the study.

In April and May of 1965, the Minnesota River Valley was struck by the most devastating flood in 84 years. The Office of Emergency Planning estimated that the valley suffered some \$43 million in damages from these floods. Only the quick action of many volunteers prevented additional damages estimated at \$34 million. After this disaster it was obvious that the project would have to be speeded up to prevent a recurrence of the tragedy. We went to work. Appearing before the Public Works Committee for the second year in a row, I asked that the survey time of the Corps of Engineers be reevaluated, and that consideration be given to the utilization of outside private and public agencies under the overall supervision of the Corps. I remarked that the only feasible means of ultimate flood control is to be found in comprehensive measures directed toward headwaters

drainage management, control of runoff, soil management, upstream water impoundment, channel improvements and sanitation controls. When the Public Works Act of 1965 was signed by the President, it contained \$150,000 for expanding and accelerating the Minnesota River Basin project.

The 1965 act also included an item of \$100,000 in planning funds appropriated to the Corps of Engineers for the flood control project on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato. This appropriation was in accordance with the project authorization which was passed by the Congress in 1958. During congressional consideration of the omnibus flood control and rivers and harbors authorization bill last year, I was successful in securing the adoption of an amendment, the purpose of which was to modify the flood control project at Mankato-North Mankato. This amendment authorized the Corps of Engineers to take into consideration flood control work being done by the local municipalities as an offset against the requirement for local contributions as set forth in the original project authorization. The city of Mankato found it necessary to construct certain flood control features during 1965 as protection against possible flooding in the spring of 1966 and future years. Since the corps had not yet commenced its construction project, it became necessary to provide that the cost of local construction in 1965 be taken into account in the corps' project. There is no request in the present bill for additional planning funds for this Mankato-North Mankato project in this fiscal year. Due to technical problems, project planning has been delayed, but I have been assured by the corps that the appropriation for the 1966 fiscal year will be sufficient for planning activities during the 1967 fiscal year.

The groundwork has been laid. The Minnesota Basin study is part of the upper Mississippi River region study which is one of 18 regional studies comprising a nationwide program of comprehensive basin surveys being undertaken on an interagency basis to provide general guides to future water resources development. This study must be continued to provide protection against the devastating floods such as those which ravaged the area last year and to provide a solid basis for the continued economic development of southern Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to extend my congratulations and commendations to the members of the Appropriations Committee and particularly to the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for what I consider to be a good public works appropriations bill.

I know the committee had a most difficult task this year because the administration's recommendations for individual projects reflected some serious under-

funding in many areas, but at the same time recommended funding for some projects which might best be described as of questionable urgency or decidedly controversial nature. The committee's task was to rewrite the administration's proposed program so as to present to the House a realistic bill which meets our national needs and obligations and yet is noninflationary. I believe the committee has admirably fulfilled its responsibility in both instances.

The bill before us involves a total appropriation which is \$56,141,000 less than the administration proposed. At the same time, it recognizes deficiencies in the administration's proposal which, if allowed to stand as had been proposed by the administration, would have seriously curtailed some vital construction. The Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington is an excellent example.

In this case the administration's proposed budget would have stopped entirely any new construction of this now half-completed project. The administration's recommendation was entirely unrealistic, especially at a time when our Nation is being called upon to assume a leading role in the world food and population crisis and in which the crops from reclamation projects are expected to play an increasingly important role.

The bill before us today reflects an increase of \$2.5 million over administration recommendations in the area of new construction on the Columbia Basin project. I commend the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and the entire committee for this action that makes it possible for us to continue orderly development of this important reclamation project.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that after a year of acrimonious debate and confusion of facts that the full Appropriations Committee, in its wisdom, is seeking a full and open study of the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project in Maine.

In this time of spiraling inflation and growing Federal expenditures such a move for a study could not be more appropriate. It is my judgment that the rapid strides of progress in the nuclear power field will make it more than evident next year, when we will be called upon to make a further decision on this project, that the project should not be built. I have recently submitted to the House various newspaper articles supporting this contention.

There has been a near-revolution in the economics of the nuclear power business, and that has never been more evident than the selection by the Tennessee Valley Authority, a Federal agency with access to low-cost funding, of a large nuclear powerplant.

Further evidence is the fact that, to quote Prof. Manson Benedict of Massachusetts Institute of Technology:

In the last few months of 1966, 40 to 50 percent of all new power generating capacity in the United States has been nuclear. There

have been 29 large nuclear powerplants placed on order in the past 2 years. Some 20,000 megawatts of electrical capacity. This is about 10 per cent of the entire generating capacity of the United States at the present time.

Such impressive statistics can lead one only to the conclusion that the electric industry in the New England area has been right when it has been insisting before our committees that nuclear power, along with efficient conventional plants and pumped-storage electric plants, is the answer to the area's problems. They are, at this very moment, backing up that opinion by spending a billion and a half dollars for just such sources of power. This, I believe, confirms that there is no need for additional Federal spending in this area.

However, now that we are to have a complete examination of the Dickey-Lincoln project by the Appropriations Committee staff, all of the evidence will be heard, including that of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the private companies as well. When all of that evidence is in, the Congress will finally be in a position to reach a decision on this project.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], whatever time he wishes.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for yielding to me.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee [Mr. KIRWAN] and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] for their foresight in approving funds for Alabama's river projects. The passage by the House of the legislation under consideration will assure that orderly construction on the Warrior-Tombigbee and the Alabama-Coosa River systems continues on schedule.

Mr. Chairman, we in Alabama are also indebted to the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee [Mr. KIRWAN] for taking time out from his busy schedule last year to visit our area to personally inspect our waterway projects. The people of Alabama sincerely appreciate his interest in the navigation projects of our State.

Included in the public works appropriation bill are the following funds for projects on the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway: \$3 million for the Holt Lock and Dam, \$1.3 million for the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam, and \$26,000 for flood control investigations. Also included in the measure are funds for the following construction projects on the Alabama-Coosa River system: \$7.5 million for the Claiborne Lock and Dam, \$3 million for the Jones Bluff lock and dam, \$13.5 million for the Millers Ferry lock and dam, and \$800,000 for channel work on the Alabama River.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the above projects, House Report No. 2044, which accompanies the public works appropriation bill now under consideration—H.R. 17787—contains the following language:

The Committee has had to defer action on the requests to provide funds in the bill for

the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway pending completion of the current economic reanalysis being conducted by the Corps of Engineers. The Committee urges that the study report be made available at an early date and has approved the use of such additional funds as may be necessary to expedite its completion. Upon the availability of the final report for review and approval, the Committee wishes to point out that it would then be in a position to allocate available funds in the Bill to resume planning of the project during the current fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, if I interpret the above language correctly, it states that upon approval of the pending Engineers' report, the committee then will be in a position to allocate funds available in the bill to resume planning on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway during the current fiscal year. Since I am hopefully optimistic that the Corps of Engineers report will be favorable, the language in House Report No. 2044 is extremely encouraging to those of us who have worked through the years to secure from Congress the funds necessary to begin this vital waterway.

Since, then, there is the possibility that planning on the Tennessee-Tombigbee can be resumed during the present fiscal year, I wish to call to my colleagues' attention the vital importance of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway and to point out that our Nation—and not Alabama only—has a big stake in connecting the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers.

While I am intensely interested, of course, in the great economic benefits the waterway will bring to my neighbors at home, this body should be aware that 76 percent of the traffic would terminate outside of Alabama and that 69.9 percent would originate outside of Alabama.

The giant share of the economic benefits, then, would accrue to other States. Moreover, our Defense Department and space program will enjoy substantial benefits when these great rivers are connected.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway would make the Tombigbee navigable from the Gulf to where it would connect with the Tennessee. Vessels entering the Tombigbee at Mobile could make their way all the way to Pittsburgh, as far west as Omaha and Sioux City, as far north as Minneapolis-St. Paul, to Chicago and the Great Lakes, and numerous other points.

By closing this relatively tiny gap divorcing two great rivers, the Nation's economy and citizens from a farflung portion of the country would benefit.

It is as if the Almighty had built an interstate highway thousands of miles long and connected it with other nature bestowed highways, then said to His children: "Use them as you wish, but to enjoy the full benefit, finish 253 miles of it yourself."

I earnestly hope the Congress will see fit to enhance the Nation's interest in the river highways God has given us by adding this portion—this connecting link—ourselves.

While the completed waterway is of national importance, west Alabama will reap benefits from the project almost from the day construction begins. Con-

struction will start at the lower end, so that the Gainesville lock and dam will be built first. Other facilities near Aliceville and Columbus, Miss., will follow. The construction of these multi-million-dollar works will require the employment of hundreds of workers and pump new life into dozens of west Alabama communities.

And the waterway will also be opened to navigation in the lower reaches while work is still in progress in north Mississippi. Thus, the fertilizer, grain, and paper industries of west Alabama and chemical plants in the Columbus area will have access to a navigable channel—serving Tuscaloosa and Birmingham to the northeast as well as Demopolis, Mobile, and points on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway—within 3 or 4 years after start of construction. It will take 8 or 10 years, of course, to finish the entire project.

When we speak of waterway improvements, thoughts of particular cities and industries come to mind. We see a great increase in employment in many cities, which is good. Yet, the Tennessee-Tombigbee link will enhance the value of thousands of miles of useful waterways by providing a much-needed connection between major segments of the waterway system. As a consequence, the farmer, housewife, the businessman, industry, and commerce will all share in the benefits.

Not only would this be a crucial link in the 10,000-mile network of midcontinent rivers, but the new water transportation advantages would directly induce industrial expansion along river banks in four States—Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Kentucky. The U.S. Army Engineer district in Mobile, on whose study I base the assertion that the Nation as a whole would enjoy economic benefits exceeding that of Alabama, has reported that 3.6 percent of the traffic would originate in Mississippi and 4.8 percent would originate in Tennessee, and these same States would have 10 and 19 percent, respectively, of the terminating traffic.

The low-cost water transportation for raw materials and finished products that would result from this project is, as an economic certainty, bound to expand commerce. This would mean increased dollars for the economy. Those dollars would go to consumers in the form of lower prices—of each dollar paid for an item, 20 cents goes to transportation of the product—and workers, industry, and farmers would enjoy the lower shipping rates. The list is endless. It is virtually impossible to find the person who would not benefit, in some way.

This project is no new idea. For more than 150 years, men have dreamed of improving and connecting the Nation's great resources of inland waters, with which Alabama is richly endowed. By making useful the natural river highway that almost connects the Tombigbee with the Tennessee River, Congress can do much, in a permanent and lasting way, to combat, the evils of underdevelopment and the resultant unemployment.

The U.S. Corps of Engineers estimates that, by connecting the Tennessee and

the Tombigbee, the annual commerce on the system would be about 12½ million tons with total yearly benefits of nearly \$13.5 million.

These dollars would find their way into widely scattered cities in at least 19 States along the waterways of mid-America. With new and expanding industry and greater employment, countless localities would enjoy broader tax bases. Undoubtedly, the costs of welfare benefits would diminish.

This, broadly, is what putting barges and towboats on this strip of water would accomplish for a vast region—and, to some degree—the whole of the United States.

Alabama records show that during the 1950's \$500 million was invested in new and expanded industrial plants along the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers. This is remarkable in itself, but it stands as a mere indicator of the flood of private dollars that would be released for industrial expansion, not only when the project is completed, but the moment it is assured. Heavy industry would not wait out the years when the locks and dams are being constructed, moving north up the waterway from Gainesville, but the effects would be felt almost immediately.

I place no strain on truth when I say that investing the estimated \$281 million—of which almost \$19 million would be incurred by local interests for relocation of highways, bridge construction and other adjustments—would be at least as great an investment in the prosperity of our people as any other Federal program that has come before this body since I have been a Member.

The project would provide a 9-foot channel, with a minimum width of 170 feet, extending from Demopolis on the Warrior-Tombigbee to Pickwick Lake on the Tennessee River. Locks in the waterway will be 600 feet long and 110 feet wide, permitting barge tows of standard size to pass without breaking formation.

Four of the 10 locks and dams will be placed in the 168-mile river section between Demopolis and Amory, Miss. There will be five locks on the 45-mile canal section immediately to the north. The divide section providing the Tennessee River connection will have one 84-foot lift lock and dam.

This would complete the waterway, rising from 73 feet above sea level at Demopolis to 412 feet at the Pickwick Pool elevation. The Southeastern Gulf area would then be connected with the 10,000-mile river system of the mid-United States. It would shorten the distance from Tennessee River cities to the Gulf of Mexico by nearly 700 miles. The distance from Cumberland River cities, such as Nashville, to the Gulf would be reduced by 300 miles.

These shortcuts will, of course, reduce transportation costs for all users who must move their products through these cities and to the Gulf.

A study by business research analysts from three universities—Alabama, Tennessee, and Mississippi—tells us that \$5 billion has been invested in new industry in the direct Tennessee-Tombigbee tributary area since 1950. We cannot gauge

the ultimate harvest of dollars the economy will sustain from this project.

Industry is already mushrooming along these waters but the rate will increase rapidly when this project is approved. This would be new capital from large industries that would not exploit other areas. The type of industry that seeks waterway locations is the type that contributes to the overall economy.

In the section of Mississippi where the proposed waterway runs, 116 new industries representing an investment of \$16 million have already located and 19 others have expanded during recent years.

Among the diverse benefits to the Nation's space and defense efforts is the fact that the Saturn missile, constructed in Huntsville, Alabama, will be 700 water miles closer to its launching site at Cape Kennedy, and the Nation will have an alternate inland route to the Gulf in the event of military necessity.

The Corps of Engineers estimates that conservation and recreation benefits of \$419,000 will increase the commercial benefits resulting from the project to almost \$14 million annually. Pools created by the dams will provide water sports and recreation facilities for tens of thousands of people.

Further enhancing the space program's interest in this project is the location, on waterways, of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's installations concerned with designing, testing, fabricating and launching missiles. These are the Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, on the Tennessee River; Michoud Operations at New Orleans, on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway; Mississippi Test Operations in Hancock County, Miss., on the Pearl River and the Kennedy Space Flight Center at Cape Kennedy on the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway occupies a strategic position by offering a direct water link between Huntsville and the other three installations. A saving of one-third in time and travel between Huntsville and Cape Kennedy would be affected by the project. By present water routes, they are 2,140 miles apart; the distance would be reduced to only 1,420. Engineers estimate this would save \$8,000 to \$13,000 per trip, and numerous trips are made annually.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee project would also save 650 miles in the trip from Huntsville to Michoud or Mississippi Test Operations.

Having an alternate route for the missile barges would be especially desirable in time of war. But the peacetime advantages of an alternate route were illustrated by the recent instances of lock failure on the Tennessee and low water of the Mississippi.

The importance of transportation by water and other means during time of war is elementary to all. We can recall the frantic building of the Alaskan Highway in the early days of World War II, and the Tennessee-Tombigbee would also take on significant, grim urgency should the Nation again be confronted by threat of war.

The construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway would have considerable impact on agriculture in America's heartland. A new annual demand of 2.28 million tons of grain from the Midwest would result from the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, the Doane Agriculture Service of St. Louis has reported. This grain purchased from the farmer in the Midwest would be used in the Middle South. Any relief that can be afforded the farmer, who has long been caught in the jaws of a cost-price squeeze is, of course, most welcome.

The commercial effects are also numerous. Coal is one example. More coal, possibly from north Alabama, would be used to generate electricity. Alabama coal of coking quality would go into foreign trade—affecting at least to some degree the balance-of-payments deficit. A mining consultant has estimated that at least a million tons of this type would be sold abroad each year when the waterway project is completed.

The new water link would make many other products of this region competitive in the open market by greatly reducing transportation costs. These include bentonite, oolitic limestone, tripoli and similar minerals, as well as the finished products of mills and factories.

I would not commend this project to the Congress simply for recreation purposes, but the incidental result of creating many beautiful, impounded lakes should not be overlooked. Preservation of recreation areas is crucial today and will become critical as the population continues to grow. But these lake areas will ever be a haven for the conservationist, the hunter, fisherman, boater, camper, and all who enjoy water sports. As our society becomes more urbanized, and it can take no other direction, these oases of pleasure will be a legacy of this Congress to unborn generations.

It is for these reasons, and the specifics of the advantages mentioned are too numerous to detail today, that this project has widespread support throughout the many affected States and a broad breadth of support from economists and others who see it as a stimulant to the Nation's prosperity.

An interstate compact composed of Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee is urging this project. It has a mutual assistance pact with Florida. Many waterway development organizations—the Mississippi Valley Association, the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Tennessee River and Tributaries Association, and the Mississippi Rivers and Harbors Association, among others—are supporting this project.

Tennessee-Tombigbee is also compatible with what is generally called the war on poverty. It would offer a major breakthrough for many areas with troubled economies. It would put many men to work in the underdeveloped Appalachian region. The Tennessee-Tombigbee direct tributary area includes 60 counties in the east Tennessee portion of Appalachia. The economic snowball that would be caused by bringing dollars and employment to these counties would roll big and for a long distance from the

water itself. Many tax recipients now on welfare would become taxpayers instead.

The late President Kennedy heard the words "pork barrel" wrongfully pinned on certain waterway programs in which the entire Nation holds a vested interest. In October of 1963, when he visited Arkansas to dedicate Greers Ferry Dam, President Kennedy replied to such criticisms.

The President, whose voice was so soon to be forever silenced, answered the critics with a question. He asked:

Which is more wasteful, to let the land lie arid and unproductive, and resources lie untapped, while rivers flow unused—or to transform these rivers into natural arteries of transportation, reclamation, power, and commerce with billion dollar benefits?

Mr. Kennedy continued:

These projects protect and create wealth—new industries, new income, new incentives and interests. And the wealth they assure to one region becomes a market for another—so that the benefits of this project also help those who manufacture automobiles in Detroit, and those who produce steel in Pittsburgh (and Birmingham too, I would think) and those who make shoes in Massachusetts and Tennessee.

President Kennedy, just days before he was assassinated, had agreed to hear our plea for Tennessee-Tombigbee funds. He had visited the area only 8 months previously and had expressed great interest in the possibilities of a canal to the sea.

The advice of Daniel Webster is as sound today as in his own time:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

This project will, indeed, be remembered by the men who receive jobs and the human dignity incident to employment; by their children who know the pain of want; by the farmer who will earn more; by the consumer who will pay less; by the vast regions where the economic benefits will be affected directly; and by the families who enjoy the by-product of recreation benefits years after we have passed from the scene and other men occupy these seats and ask themselves: what, in the year 1966, did Congress accomplish? The answer can be: "Very much"—if this is the year Tennessee-Tombigbee finally gets a green light.

The estimates presented today are not abstract theories. They have stood the stern test of experience. Canalization of the Ohio River, from its origin at Pittsburgh to its junction with the Mississippi, was completed in 1930 when the Corps of Engineers estimated future tonnage at 13 million tons per year.

But time proved the Engineers' estimate to be extremely low. Commerce moving on the Ohio increased from 10 million tons in 1930 to 80 million tons in 1960. Just since 1950—and this is even more significant—more than 350 major industrial plant locations or expansions have been recorded on waterside sites

along the Ohio River at an estimated capital outlay of more than \$22 billion.

This is dollars-and-cents proof of the wisdom of Tennessee-Tombigbee. Where else can our Government, for so long concerned with the prosperity of her citizens, make a wiser investment? Literally thousands of jobs and the welfare of countless families are at stake in this project. Not only jobs now, or 5 years from now, but jobs for unborn children who would otherwise crowd cities already burdened with unemployment. This two-way highway will open a new market for any number of products for mid-America.

The project is more than worthy in itself, but I must note that we look with no disfavor on suggestions that nuclear demolition be used to dig the divide-cut section. The Corps of Engineers has expressed interest in employing this device.

Using nuclear demolition techniques at home has a secondary advantage of promoting favorable worldwide opinion. It would be a dramatic demonstration of the employment of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Moreover, if we must build a new canal to replace or supplement the Panama Canal, use of nuclear energy will effect a savings of many millions of dollars there. Wherever and whenever we build this interoceanic canal, which is certain some day, it will of geographic necessity be outside our own borders. If we have already used nuclear energy in construction projects inside the United States, our Central American friends should have fewer qualms about using the same fearful but effective energy to build a canal through their region.

Both time and need have met on this issue. We can greatly enhance the economy of our Nation and the prosperity of our people with the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, and we can effect great savings through the practical use of energy previously associated in the public mind only with disaster, tragedy, fear, and tears.

I said earlier that the Tennessee-Tombigbee survey was authorized. The project was rejected then, mainly on the basis of a question posed by the engineer who conducted the survey: "Whence is the trade to come that will support it?" The Nation was recovering from a terrible civil war; there was little industry and few farm crops. The project lay dormant for many years.

Other surveys were made and several possible routes were considered. After weighing all factors, including the movement of potential commerce, the U.S. Corps of Engineers concluded that the best route was to join the Tennessee and Tombigbee in northeast Mississippi, where the dividing ridge is only about 150 feet above Pickwick Pool and has very little rock.

That is precisely what we propose in the Tennessee-Tombigbee project.

After conducting half a dozen more surveys, Congress finally authorized the project in 1945. Babies born when the Congress first authorized the project are voters today. But appropriations were

not forthcoming, and a restudy was undertaken in 1956.

This was the most painstaking, thorough examination of the waterway ever made. The final report was not presented until 1962. This report showed the Tennessee-Tombigbee project economically feasible, and it was officially declared ready for construction.

Our Nation's policy of improving our rivers as a commonsense investment in nature's great gift of river highways dates back to the Northwest Ordinance. It has been enunciated again and again by our statesmen, including Abraham Lincoln who made a forceful speech on Federal improvements when he sat, as a Congressman, as we do today. Presidents of the United States whose philosophies of government were as diverse as Herbert Hoover and Franklin Roosevelt have both spoken with fervor in favor of improving our waterways.

I can think of no further assurances that man could devise that would better show the wisdom of this project than what has already been demonstrated again and again, and only briefly reviewed by me today.

Without reservation, I commend this project to the Congress.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] whatever time he desires.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the State of Utah and other States of the Rocky Mountain West have reason to be very grateful for the provisions of the bill before this Committee, and particularly grateful for the distinguished chairman [Mr. KIRWAN], who has come out to Utah and who has familiarized himself with our problems. He has been fair and equitable in every way. This bill appropriates \$7,500,000 for immediate construction of the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project, as well as \$99,500 for advance planning on the Jensen unit, and \$188,350 for the Upalco unit. For Utah this is a great leap forward. The central Utah project recently celebrated its 10th anniversary, having been authorized in 1956. As of today, however, none of its principal units have passed beyond the planning stage. The money here appropriated will enable the dirt to fly, and actual construction to commence. This, in turn, will bring water to parched soil, and electric power to fill the power needs of burgeoning communities. Ten years of legislative effort find culmination in this bill. This is a red-letter day for Utah. I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the committee members for making it possible.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time so that I could pose some questions to the distinguished chairman of the committee relative to the Big Pine Reservoir in Indiana. This project has been authorized by the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States. It is a very worthwhile project, and has an excellent economic feasibility. It is a key project

in the water control problem that we face in the Wabash Valley, Big Pine River being a tributary of the Wabash. I wonder if the chairman could tell me why funds were not allocated to this most necessary project in Indiana? The project has long been studied by the Corps of Engineers and provides an excellent natural site for a reservoir. Its economic ratio feasibility is splendid, and the communities involved strongly support its immediate construction.

Mr. KIRWAN. There was no budget request for the project. Of the limited number of unbudgeted items that the committee could add to the bill, Indiana got three. I am sorry we could not do better than that, but that is the best we could do.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I would direct further remarks to the chairman of the committee. I understand there is only so much money to be spent for water control projects. I am grateful that the committee saw fit to include funds for the Greenfield Bayou levee project, which is in the district that I currently represent. But I must admit a great deal of regret that the committee could not see fit to include also initial funds for Big Pine Reservoir, because this reservoir is an important project to the whole system of water and flood control for the Wabash Valley.

Mr. KIRWAN. We will certainly give the project every consideration in future bills.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to say for the record that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] has been very diligent in pushing for this project. Certainly I share the opinion of the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the committee, that in the future we will try to look at all worthwhile projects such as this with favor. My great respect for the gentleman from Indiana will certainly enhance the favor with which I regard Big Pine. He is a valuable Member of Congress.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I certainly thank the gentleman. I would like to remark further that on several occasions I have appeared before the committee in behalf of this project, Big Pine Reservoir; the Wabash Valley Association, which has been very diligent in studying the water problems of the Middle West, also has utilized a great deal of effort in support of Big Pine. I regret the lack of funds for initial work on the project and hope that it will not be further delayed.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN].

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and the members of his committee for the excellent way in which this bill has been brought before this House, and particularly for including in it a great new start for water

development in North Dakota by providing funds for the Garrison diversion project. I am also very pleased that the bill contains funds to complete the Bowman Haley Reservoir project.

The development of our water resources is most important at all times to maintain the strength of our Nation. North Dakota is proud to be a part of this great national effort.

I urge my colleagues to support the public works appropriation bill of 1967 without amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] as much time as she consumes.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and the members of the subcommittee who have worked so diligently to recognize the needs of some of our districts whose economies are not based upon defense, but upon the development of natural resources, and depend upon shipping and the development of our rivers and harbors to solve their problems.

From the district which I represent we give you our deepest appreciation for your understanding and your kindness.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Chairman, may I express the appreciation of Colorado to Chairman KIRWAN and the committee? As the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING], has said, all of the people located in the Rocky Mountain area have the deepest appreciation for the courtesies and the expenditure of time and interest that members of this committee and its distinguished chairman have shown in understanding the problems that we have.

Certainly, we know what floods are, with the experience we have had in Colorado last year. We have every reason to know what this bill can mean to the future of our area as it embodies the Chatfield Dam. Certainly the gratitude of all those in Colorado should be expressed to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and his committee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join some of my other colleagues in commending the Appropriations Committee for the action that it has recommended to the House on the Dickey-Lincoln School project.

By ordering a full, complete, and independent study of this project they have vindicated my motion for such a study last year and have once again supported the action last year of the full House in voting for my study motion. I have only several brief further comments to make at this time.

I am confident that a study conducted by the Appropriations Committee staff will include any and all sources of information. I assume that they will seek

out a number of Federal agencies for facts, including the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Reserve Bank, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Commerce and Treasury Departments as well as the Interior Department and the Corps of Engineers. I assume as well that the full investigatory powers of the committee will be used to seek after information from the private electric companies of the region and any other sources of pertinent information.

I am certain as well that the full powers of the committee staff will be used in thoroughly examining alternative methods of producing this power such as large conventional electric plants, atomic power plants and pumped-storage electric plants that are now well underway in the New England area as part of the privately-financed \$1½ billion building program of the investor-owned electric companies, who incidentally paid \$177,000,000 in taxes last year.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable MICHAEL KIRWAN and the other members of the Appropriations Committee for doing a good job.

I want to thank the members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works for allowing \$190,000 in the omnibus public works bill for planning for the Weymouth Fore and Town River Project. The budget request for this project was \$90,000. In my testimony before the Public Works Subcommittee during hearings on the bill, I urged an increase in planning funds for Weymouth Fore and Town Rivers because the Army Corps of Engineers had indicated that it was in the position to accelerate planning of this project.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, the Gathright Dam, to be constructed on the upper reaches of Virginia's James River, is not specifically included in the fiscal year 1967 budget. However, it must not be thought that the Gathright Dam is some sudden, fanciful, frivolous project, conceived as an afterthought by some overzealous civic-minded citizen organization.

Mr. Chairman, the Gathright Dam was authorized by this Congress two decades ago. Restudy and redesign, which have consumed much of the intervening period, have only reinforced the original judgment of the Congress. Increased population, increased water utilization, increased water pollution, and increased drought conditions have combined to make the project not merely feasible, not merely desirable, but absolutely essential.

In the past, there has been considerable organized and unorganized opposition to this project. There still remains some. However, with the increased needs and the new design features, most of the opposition has been withdrawn or abandoned. Indeed, some of its most vigorous opponents have become some of its most enthusiastic advocates.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I urge that this House ratify the action the Committee on Public Works has taken and retain the appropriation item which will

enable this project to take its first giant step forward.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17787. I can think of no projects that we will consider in this Congress entitled to greater priority than those contained in this bill, especially those which are essential to the relief of the serious shortages of adequate water supply to metropolitan communities.

I wish especially to call to the attention of Members one item in particular which is vital to the people of my district and, for that matter, to a large portion of the population of Virginia. I refer to the item appropriating \$1.5 million to commence construction of the Gathright Dam, which will insure relief to those who rely upon the James River as their source of water.

Our problem in Virginia is not primarily one of an insufficient annual supply of water, but rather one of an irregular supply, with the result that we are besieged, on the one hand, by damaging floods and on the other by a critical lack of water in times of drought. Only by controlling the average flow of water by artificially retaining the surplus when it is available we can hope to solve the problem that confronts the James River basin.

Already the flow of the James River at Richmond has at times practically ceased and stagnant pools then created not only constitute a health hazard, but support the growth of microorganisms which frequently spoil the taste of drinking water during these critical periods. Present projections indicate that within the next half decade the increased demand for water, as a result of population growth alone, will create for our metropolitan area an emergency due to a lack of water for consumption and, more seriously perhaps, a lack of water for sanitary and other needs. Although efforts are attempted to reflect by numerical designation the relative value of some projects, I believe we will all agree that no such measurement can reflect with any degree of accuracy the basic needs of people. It is on this basis that we have sought this facility and because time is running out for us, I ask the Members of the House to act favorably upon this bill and to leave these needed funds intact.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House will provide funds for national cemeteries. Unfortunately that does not go far enough. Efforts were made here in the House to have a small sum of \$250,000 appropriation added to this measure for the express purpose of reopening Beverly National Cemetery in New Jersey and to keep open four other national cemeteries scheduled to close in the next few months. Two of these four are major cemeteries in California, the only two national cemeteries serving the California area. These efforts were supported by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Catholic War Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, and the Veterans of World War I.

Beverly National Cemetery in New Jersey served the State of Delaware until it was closed in February of this year. Since Beverly closed, this House should know that 31 of our dead from Vietnam have been denied burial in that cemetery. This number is continuing to grow each month as the war goes on. No more than six of these dead of the conflict in Vietnam were subsequently buried in Arlington National Cemetery. The families of the other 25 were forced to accept the denial of the honor due these men and they were buried in private cemeteries.

The \$250,000 appropriation sought to reopen Beverly would have put an end to this injustice to our honored dead. It is tragic that in a bill of this magnitude, which provides millions of dollars for less worthy purposes, no place could be found for a provision that would end the discrimination that has taken effect with the closing of Beverly. The closing of Beverly affects servicemen and veterans and their families who have their homes in Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. Servicemen from these States are effectively denied burial in a national cemetery near their homes. At the same time there are national cemeteries in other areas that will remain open for the next 50 years.

Mr. Chairman, the national cemetery problem must be solved. Until it is possible to bring an end to the present closure policy of the Executive, it is incumbent upon the Congress to insure that no further inequities be built into the system. I would hope that before this Congress goes home, action will be taken to reopen Beverly National Cemetery, and keep the other cemeteries open as well.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have sought this action and they have been supported all the way by the other veteran organizations in a united front. The New Jersey congressional delegation has pressed for correction of the grave injustice I have reported to you and they have been supported by colleagues from Pennsylvania and, I may say, from California. Unfortunately, the day is not far off when the dead who are returned from Vietnam for an honored burial will not find a last resting place in the national cemeteries in California, as is now the case with Delaware's war heroes at Beverly National Cemetery.

An indication of the concern among veterans organizations with respect to the national cemetery crisis is seen in the fact that at the recent national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in New York no less than 21 resolutions were approved which dealt with the need for solving this growing problem.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that there may have been a reluctance to approve the requested \$250,000 appropriation for Beverly National Cemetery and for Fort Rosecrans and Golden Gate National Cemeteries in California because of the possibility that such action might encroach upon the functions of legislative committees. Mr. Chairman, there is no merit to this concern. The Secretary of the Army is fully authorized

to establish and to expand national cemeteries according to need.

The need is clear, and the need is great. This House may yet have an opportunity to act to reopen Beverly, and to act with justice. If and when that time does come, I would urge all of my colleagues to give their support to this worthy purpose. We speak often of rights these days, Mr. Chairman. A man who gives his life on the battlefield in Vietnam has a right to be buried in a national cemetery. Some of these brave men have been denied that right. And there is no end in sight to this injustice until and unless this body acts.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17787. This bill carries funds for many projects which are now under construction, for new starts, and for planning. This bill probably takes more criticism than any bill that comes before us, being referred to as "logrolling," "pork barrel," and many other unflattering names. However, I believe that these projects are needed and they have been authorized after long and extensive studies.

About 10 years ago a study of hurricane damage and measures to protect our coastlines and the citizens was authorized. The report of the Chief of Engineers on certain areas included in this study was made last year and the authorization was included in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill which passed the House last September. I have specific reference to the project titled East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet and Jamaica Bay for which the bill before us provides \$200,000 for planning. It has taken a long time to get this far and much more time will elapse before the protection which it is designed to give will become a reality.

While I am interested in all these projects which are designed to bring direct benefits to our citizens, I shall confine myself to that one which directly affects my own congressional district, the Seventh of New York, hurricane protection in Jamaica Bay.

Mr. Chairman, each time that we have a report of a hurricane, my constituents who live on or have businesses on Jamaica Bay literally "quake in their boots" for fear they may have a repetition of serious storms and damages of the past.

Jamaica Bay is 8 miles long, 4 miles wide, and covers an area of approximately 26 square miles. Communities in my district which border on the bay are Howard Beach, Rosedale—reached by Hook Creek—and the John F. Kennedy International Airport, a city unto itself.

Howard Beach, which has experienced an enormous growth since 1960, is constantly under the threat of flooding in the shore area from any abnormally high tides.

Rosedale, which is not physically on the Bay, experiences floods of up to three feet at times through Hook Creek, which runs into the bay.

The John F. Kennedy International Airport, located entirely within my congressional district, occupies approximately 4,900 acres of land bordering on

Jamaica Bay between Bergen Basin and head of bay—we might even say that it is in the bay as the airport expands its runways into the bay. Flooding from severe storms causes disruption to flight activities and delivery of necessary fuel and supplies which reach the airport by way of Jamaica Bay.

Adequate hurricane protection will bring untold benefits to untold numbers of people. Jamaica Bay has the potential for becoming a great recreation area bringing jobs and other outlets so greatly needed in this area of New York.

This detail on this one project is given because I am so vitally interested in it, and I am confident that an equally good case could be given for the other projects carried in H.R. 17787 and, for this reason, I urge its approval.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate this opportunity to express my appreciation for the work of the Appropriations Committee and its chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] of the Public Works Subcommittee, on H.R. 17787.

The appropriation bill contains funds for several much-needed projects in the State of West Virginia. I wish to say that I have had a number of conversations with gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] with respect to the Burnsville Reservoir project, and am pleased to note that this bill carries \$290,000 which will complete its planning. I am certain that next year, we will obtain a much larger appropriation for the Burnsville Reservoir because this will be the initial year of its construction. The Burnsville Reservoir is located in Braxton County on the Little Kanawha River, 123.5 miles above its confluence with the Ohio River, and nine-tenths of a mile above Burnsville, W. Va. This proposed reservoir is much needed because of the frequent minor floods and periodic major flooding that occurs. The project consists of three reservoir systems, one to be located at Burnsville, one at Steer Creek, and one on the West Fork. The construction of this project should greatly enhance the use of the flood plan for industrial and small business development. By controlling the flood waters, the project when completed would add materially to the prospects of industrial development of the area which already has adequate market and transportation facilities.

The total cost of Burnsville Reservoir is estimated to be \$21 million, and I acknowledge the help of the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. KIRWAN] in seeing to it that the rest of the planning funds have been included in this appropriation bill, together with the firm commitment that construction funds will be included for fiscal year 1968.

Also included and of major importance to the First Congressional District is the Rowlesburg Reservoir project. While this reservoir in itself is not situated in the First Congressional District of West Virginia, the reservoir would have a gross storage capacity of 831,700 acre-feet, and will control a drainage area of approximately 936 square miles, which area does touch parts of the First Congressional District of West Virginia.

The project as originally submitted to the Congress provided for an expenditure this year of \$400,000 for the purpose of continuing the planning of the project. I was pleased that after a number of conversations with the chairman [Mr. KIRWAN] that he and the other members of the committee have seen fit to add an additional \$380,000 to the \$400,000 that was previously budgeted so that today, by passing this bill, we are providing \$780,000 for the Rowlesburg Reservoir project. The total estimated cost of this reservoir is \$92,700,000, but it represents an effort to control the Cheat River which has a drainage area of 1,424 square miles and is the largest uncontrolled tributary in the headwaters of the Ohio River. I have been in the past and continue, as evidenced by my representations to the chairman [Mr. KIRWAN] interested in seeing to it that the Rowlesburg Reservoir project is realized as quickly as possible. I appreciate very much the members of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations responding to my request that additional funds be placed in this year's budget for the planning of Rowlesburg Reservoir project. This will permit the Corps of Engineers to reach the construction stage somewhat earlier than originally planned.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I desire to again express my sincere thanks to Mr. KIRWAN for his many kindnesses during the period of my service in the Congress, and also to the members of the committee for including funds in the amount set out in this appropriation bill.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, after many many years of effort on the part of farseeing people, the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway now is at a crucial stage.

Following a 1962 report of the Corps of Engineers, a report favorable to the project, a new study is being completed. The result is expected later this year.

The purpose of my statement today is to support action which will enable the project to begin during fiscal year 1967 provided, of course, that the Corps of Engineers presents a favorable report.

It has been established that the Corps of Engineers will have a capability during fiscal year 1967 to commence work on the project assuming that the upcoming report will show the project to be economically feasible.

Enthusiasm for the project has reached a peak in recent months as interested people throughout the South and elsewhere in the Nation have expressed interest and approval.

In November 1965, I was able to participate with the subcommittee's able chairman, Congressman KIRWAN, of Ohio, as he toured the Tennessee-Tombigbee area and met with interested people in the port city of Mobile.

His very definite and informed opinion, expressed many times in the course of that tour, was summed up when he said:

The Tombigbee project must be constructed for continued growth of America.

There are few public projects in the United States which would have the dramatic impact of the Tennessee-Tombig-

bee project. Together with the proposed Ohio River-Lake Erie project, the vision involved here is one of connecting the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico with direct water transportation.

The two items are the missing links in this plan which has been the hope of transportation men for many years. It would provide an economic boost of mammoth proportions to all of the Eastern United States.

The proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway would be 253 miles in length. A series of locks and dams, plus 45 miles of canal, would be constructed.

Let me merely say that this project is clearly in the national interest. It is vital that we recognize the need for building the Tennessee-Tombigbee as a means of realizing the gigantic benefits which will accrue to ours and succeeding generations.

People of vision have been seeking to make this project a reality for 100 years, and it is certainly my belief that we are on the threshold of a major breakthrough.

I join with the committee in urging the Corps of Engineers to expedite the approval of this project. I thank the committee for its interest in and concern for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project. It is my great hope that during fiscal year 1967, this very important undertaking can become a reality and that the dreams of man for 100 years can be realized.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the rains that in the recent days have ended the drought for the time at least, in many sections of our country were certainly helpful but did little to improve the long-range water shortage situation. The problem will be with us for a long time to come. In fact, there is every prospect that water will continue to be a major domestic problem for Congress to deal with throughout the remaining years of the 20th century.

I commend wholeheartedly the members of the Committee on Appropriations and particularly the members of the Public Works Appropriation Subcommittee for facing up to this problem during their consideration of the bill before us today. While I appreciate that the \$56 million savings under the President's budget estimate results mainly from a reduction in the appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission, it is nevertheless true that the amount recommended for Army Corps of Engineers projects is more than \$50 million less than last year's appropriation and \$6.5 million below the budget request. Despite the fact that the committee has provided funds for 24 unbudgeted new construction starts on flood control and navigational projects, we have the committee's assurance that only the highest priority requests for such projects were approved. As the committee notes in its report, before public works projects are eligible for funds they are subject to an exhaustive review process to assure that they are economically justified. Each project must meet stringent criteria to assure that the benefits will fully justify the cost. Local and State governments

must provide assurance of their willingness to meet their share of the cost, including repayment for that portion of any project dedicated to local water supply use.

From my own experience I can affirm that the justification process is most thorough. This bill contains funds for three projects vital to the continued growth and economic prosperity of a large part of central Illinois. They are the Shelbyville Dam and Reservoir, on the Kaskaskia River, for which \$6.3 million is provided to continue construction; \$240,000 to complete the preconstruction planning of Oakley Reservoir near Decatur, and \$220,000 for the second year's planning work on Lincoln Reservoir near Charleston. I am confident that the first construction money will be budgeted for Oakley in January, thus making it possible for the actual work on the dam to begin no later than the spring of 1968. The estimated total preconstruction planning cost of Lincoln Reservoir is \$480,000. The \$220,000 in this bill plus the \$100,000 with which planning was initiated during fiscal 1966, will leave only \$160,000 in planning work needed to be done. We anticipate this amount will be budgeted in January, making it possible for construction to start in the summer of 1968.

Valuable and vital flood control, recreational and water pollution control benefits will result from the Lincoln and Oakley projects but the most urgent reason for completing them in the shortest time possible, is the critical need of both Charleston and Decatur for more adequate water supplies. Both cities are experiencing the problems that usually accompany economic growth. The threat of acute water shortages hangs over Charleston and Decatur and will continue to dangle until the Lincoln and Oakley Reservoirs are completed.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1967 contains funds for a very important Long Island project which today is soundly underway.

Under the bill, \$550,000 is to be allocated toward dredging and other work undertaken by the Corps of Engineers. Last year, the Congress appropriated \$200,000 in initial funds. The project was authorized by the 1962 River and Harbor Act.

Both the city and State of New York are meeting their obligations under the terms of this project, which requires 50 percent non-Federal participation.

This program provides for dredging a 350-acre anchorage to a depth of 7 feet in the southern part of Little Neck Bay, Long Island, with an entrance channel 7 feet deep and 200 feet wide from water in the northern part of the bay.

On April 22, 1966, the Engineers awarded a contract to the Great Lakes Dredging & Docking Co., of Manhattan, to initiate the first phase of the project.

It is of great importance to the efficient continuation of this project that the Congress approve the item of \$550,000 for Little Neck Bay appearing in this year's public works bill. After several years of surveys and the 1962 authorization, funds are now desperately needed to pre-

vent further catastrophic deterioration of the bay and reclaim it for public use. I commend the committee for including these funds.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I know that I echo the feelings of many millions of veterans and their families around the country in expressing my disappointment that the public works appropriations measure being considered today does not contain an additional \$250,000 to maintain and expand our national veterans' cemetery system. On July 15, my New Jersey colleagues, Representatives FLORENCE DWYER, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, WILLIAM CAHILL, and I wrote to the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Public Works urging the inclusion of this amount to reopen Beverly national cemetery in New Jersey, and to keep open four other cemeteries scheduled to close in fiscal year 1967. These other four are Golden Gate National Cemetery, San Bruno, Calif.; Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery, San Diego, Calif.; Fort Harrison National Cemetery, Richmond, Va., and Camp Nelson National Cemetery, Nicholasville, Ky.

In each of these cases, land is available for transfer from surplus Federal needs or for purchase. The need for additional space is obvious. In the case of returning war dead from Vietnam, the number of incidents where families have been unable to inter their loved ones in a place of national honor within the national cemetery system are increasing. I understand that as of the end of June, more than 24 had been turned away at Beverly National Cemetery in New Jersey. While the ratio is one out of every four families choosing national cemetery burial for their deceased servicemen, a higher ratio than for veterans generally, I am sure that it would be even higher if the opportunities were available.

It may be that the request for the added \$250,000 to reactivate our national cemetery policy has been left unconsidered on the grounds that action by the Appropriations Committee would have encroached on the jurisdiction of a legislative committee. This assumes the need for some additional authorization. There is no indication in the law or in the attitude of the Department of the Army that such additional authorization would be necessary. Chapter 7, title 24, section 271 of the United States Code reads:

SEC. 271. MANNER OF ACQUISITION OF LANDS.—The Secretary of the Army shall purchase from the owners thereof, at such price as may be mutually agreed upon between the Secretary and such owners, such real estate as in his judgment is suitable and necessary for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions for national cemeteries, and obtain from such owners the title in fee simple for the same. And in case the Secretary of the Army is not able to agree with any owner upon the price to be paid for any real estate needed for such purpose, or to obtain from such owner title in fee simple for the same, the Secretary is authorized to enter upon and appropriate any real estate which, in his judgment, is suitable and necessary for such purposes.

A later section, 271a, authorizes the Secretary of the Army to accept title from any State land to be used for na-

tional cemetery purposes. The only instances where a specific authorization has been used has been in the case of making surplus military property available for national cemetery use at specific cemeteries. The purchase of privately owned land is not involved in these instances.

On the other hand, there is precedent for an appropriation for the development of national cemetery property without any specific authorization. In the late 1940's Congress appropriated \$50,000 in connection with the establishment of the Black Hills National Cemetery in South Dakota. In fiscal year 1951, the Department of the Army asked for appropriations to expand six active cemeteries, receiving from Congress funds for expansion of three such cemeteries.

Only last December 4, 1965, the Chief of the Memorial Division, Col. James C. MacFarland, told the committee on legislative programs of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

On July 1, 1953, the Assistant Secretary of the Army reviewed the entire policy on establishing national cemeteries. He was convinced that the Secretary of the Army still had authority to establish national cemeteries on nonmilitary land without specific legislative authority in each case.

While the Army thus chose not to exercise its authority to establish new cemeteries, it continued up until the 1960's to initiate and vigorously support actions to expand existing cemeteries when it was desirable and feasible, generally by the purchase of adjacent private property or the transfer of suitable contiguous Government land.

In the same period, the Army was successful in expanding Beverly, Long Island, Fort Gibson, and Santa Fe by the purchase of land; Barrancas, Fort Leavenworth, Rock Island, Fort Rosecrans, Jefferson Barracks, and Fort Snelling by the transfer of Government property; and Keokuk by the acceptance of donated land.

There is ample authority, therefore, for action by Congress through the appropriation process. Land is available at each of the cemeteries I have mentioned. Any delay will simply increase the costs which are presently reasonable.

At Golden Gate National Cemetery, San Bruno, Calif., 5 additional acres could be developed at the cost of \$50,000. Golden Gate National Cemetery is expected to close about December 30, 1966. Thirty acres of available surplus Navy property lies contiguous to the cemetery by means of a corridor across private property.

One additional acre, purchased and developed from private land reported to be available, would cost \$12,500 at Fort Harrison National Cemetery, Richmond, Va.; the same is true at Camp Nelson National Cemetery, Nicholasville, Ky. Surplus naval property is also contiguous to Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery, San Diego, where 5 acres could be transferred under specific existing legislative authority, and developed for a sum of \$50,000.

With respect to Beverly National Cemetery in New Jersey, 10 acres could be purchased and developed from available land for \$125,000. In each situation, estimates have been made of the probable number of requests for interment

from July 1, 1966 to June 30, 1967. While this would be no substitute for the reestablishment and reaffirmation of a consistent, complete national cemetery policy, it would allow the Congress and the administration time to decide upon such a policy, while preserving the existing system.

The crux of the matter is not encroachment upon some committee's legislative jurisdiction. It is the attitude of the executive branch toward the national cemetery system. As Colonel MacFarland wrote to the VFW national legislative service director, Mr. Francis W. Stover, August 5, 1966; regarding Beverly Cemetery:

No effort has been made to determine the suitability of the parcels of land mentioned above for cemetery use in view of the present administration policy on nonexpansion of the National Cemetery System.

The bankruptcy of the present policy was clearly indicated by a letter of May 4, 1966, from Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor, to Mr. L. Eldon James, national commander, the American Legion. Secretary Resor wrote that he could not "conceive of any arguments in favor of a piecemeal expansion," and that any expansion "should be orderly, systematic and with the object of providing a nationwide distribution of cemeteries so that all eligibles could truly be said to enjoy the same entitlement." Certainly no Member of Congress, no veteran would disagree with the preference for this latter type of expansion. But they have and should disagree with the Secretary's conclusion that the non-expansion policy should be continued.

I understand that an amendment will be offered in the Senate by the senior New Jersey Senator to provide for the \$250,000 in appropriations for expansion of the cemetery system. My purpose this afternoon is to bring to the attention of the House the facts concerning the national cemetery system, and to underline the appropriateness of Congress acting in this fashion. I am confident that should such a Senate amendment be accepted and go to conference, that it will have the full support of this body, particularly the 90 or more Members who have introduced legislation to further the national cemetery system. We are buying more than land; we are buying time to allow the Congress, through such a device as the special committee I have suggested, to fill the void left by the indifference of the administration and establish a coordinated, complete national cemetery system policy. We can do no less for our honored dead.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, one specific item in this bill has particular importance for Maryland, and for all of us who live and work in the Metropolitan Washington area. This is the appropriation of \$1,265,000 in planning funds for the Bloomington Dam and Reservoir on the North Branch of the Potomac River in Garrett County, Md., and West Virginia.

As our experience in the past few summers clearly shows, this great and growing region can no longer afford to depend solely on the weather for a fully

adequate water supply. Water consumption in western Maryland and in the Washington area is increasing every year, and the Potomac River, our primary source, cannot supply our residential, industrial, and municipal needs during periods of low flow. Voluntary restrictions on water use were ordered here in Washington earlier this month, and compulsory restrictions have been in force most of the summer in several Maryland cities which also rely wholly on the Potomac. This situation promises to grow more acute in every future year, and the one existing upstream reservoir, the Savage Reservoir in Garrett County, cannot alone provide the low-flow augmentation we will need.

The Bloomington Dam, authorized in 1962, has great promise both as a source of additional water supply in low-flow periods, and as an instrument of flood control. When completed, this great dam will permit us to moderate the "feast-or-famine" water situation we on the Potomac have so long endured, and by "we" I include the entire National Capital area. It will greatly reduce damages to valuable flood-plain lands, and will encourage industrial development along the North Branch and the main stem of the Potomac by insuring adequate water supplies at all times. Designed to meet predictable water needs through 1985, the Bloomington Dam will be an economic asset to us all.

Mr. Chairman, this bill appropriates \$1,265,000 for the last stages of preconstruction engineering for the dam. I am pleased that, in making this appropriation, the committee has recognized the great importance of completing the dam as soon as possible, and has provided \$600,000 above the \$665,000 included in the budget. The Corps of Engineers has testified that the additional funds will permit them to complete now certain engineering tasks which, if done now rather than later, will accelerate completion of the project by at least a year, moving its completion date forward to 1973 rather than 1974.

While I cannot predict the water situation in 1973, and thus cannot predict what economic losses from either floods or shortages will be precluded by acceleration of this project, I am convinced that it is in the public interest to invest \$600,000 more this year, in order to save perhaps many times that amount in the future.

I am pleased that this appropriation has gained the support of the entire Maryland congressional delegation, and especially appreciate the committee's and subcommittee's understanding of its exceptional merit.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of H.R. 17787, as reported by the Public Works Committee.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the action taken by the Appropriations Committee in calling for a thorough study of the Dickey power project is worthy of our support and our thanks. It offers us the opportunity finally to gain a better view of all the facts concerning this controversial project and will enable us to make a

clearer decision when the Appropriations staff reports back to us.

The committee deserves our thanks for finding this course of action to better guide the House. Further thanks are in order as well for many of my colleagues, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], who joined so many of us in persistently seeking out the real facts on a bipartisan basis.

It is interesting to note that so many of us in New England, who have consistently supported public power projects in other parts of the country, did not support this project because we did not feel there was sufficient information available to do so. Recent rapid developments in the art of nuclear power would seem to indicate that our reservations concerning this project were well founded. We are indeed fortunate that so many of our Members in New England and elsewhere have persisted in their demands for a full and independent examination of the project. My personal feelings are such that I still am opposed to the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam but will go along with the proposal offered by the committee.

It is amazing that a first-term Member, WILLIAM HATHAWAY, of Maine, is able to get a project of this size, \$303 million without a feasibility study ever having been made. Recently I visited the St. Johns River; there was not enough water in the flow of the river to go for a canoe ride. It would take 20 years to fill this reservoir which would be the sixth largest in the world. I believe it will be obsolete before it is completed. By 1980 more than 25 percent of the electric power of America will be nuclear generated. I have been a public power supporter all my life. What New England needs is about five nuclear plants; this should be our goal and we would have cheaper rates in our area.

Between the Maine project for beet sugar, and the Dickey-Lincoln Dam, both of which I oppose, but I must confess—I know BILL HATHAWAY is a hard worker and able—I cannot understand the administration supporting these meritless projects. It is apparent that Congressman HATHAWAY has set a record as a first-term Congressman, getting money for the State of Maine. I respect his intelligence, zeal, and ability and support the committee report which spells out a study will be made and reported back to Congress.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, at long last we are to find the true facts on the Dickey-Lincoln School project. The action taken by our Appropriations Committee in ordering a full and complete study of the project is a big step forward.

We must, of course, make sure that the study is full, complete, and independent to avoid a recurrence of the sound and fury heard on this project so far. I have every confidence that the Appropriations Committee will pursue the facts wherever and whenever they can find them and in so doing will bring back to this House a true picture of the project.

The Appropriations Committee wording, which states that this study is in order before any further acceleration of preliminary engineering, marks the first official indication by a House or Senate committee that the project is open to serious question. I think there has been little question in the minds of many of the Members that it has been open to question, if for no other reason than the fact that we have been unable to get answers to our many questions. Now perhaps we will.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this appropriation. Among all the substantial Federal expenditures which Congress has been asked to authorize this session, those funded by this bill appear to be the lowest in priority and the most easily postponed.

Some of the projects included in the public works appropriation bill should go forward now; but others should be deferred until the economy has been restored to a better balance.

Shortly we will be asked to vote for two measures aimed at slowing down capital investment in the private sector. One would suspend the 7-percent investment tax credit, and the other would suspend accelerated depreciation.

Yet through the bill before us we would authorize billions of dollars in new capital investment. I am sure that the committee has sought conscientiously to recommend only worthwhile projects. But inflationary pressures on the economy call for even further restraint with respect to projects which can be postponed without serious harm.

I want to renew my plea that Congress accept its share of the responsibility for enacting fiscal measures appropriate to the circumstances in which we find ourselves. Until this is done, we have an obligation to all those who are harmed by inflation to exercise increased restraint.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to support this bill funding public works projects which will protect and enhance the resource values which have made this Nation great.

I can appreciate the problems encountered by the subcommittee in deciding which of the many worthwhile and needed projects to fund for the coming fiscal year. Witnesses asked for budget increases of over \$181 million involving 326 projects. The final cost of these projects would exceed \$2.5 billion.

Although I cannot help expressing my disappointment that two vital projects in my district, Lost Creek and the Siuslaw dredging project, were among those not funded, I am pleased that two of the 24 unbudgeted new construction starts approved are projects in the Fourth District of Oregon. One is the breakwater extension in Port Orford. The people of this independent community have built and rebuilt their port facilities and have built a breakwater; all without ever receiving any Federal financial assistance. Only when the people found that they would not be able to solve their own problems did they ask their Federal Government to give them a hand.

The second new project is the Reedsport dike construction at the mouth of the Umpqua River. This dike project is needed to protect the city from flooding when high river flows combine with high tides.

I know that some persons will question the wisdom of spending \$4.1 billion on Federal projects during this time of taut economic conditions, however, the funds appropriated through this bill can not be characterized as unnecessary expenditures. Every one of these projects will return to the people many times their costs over the years. Floods are going to be paid for, whether by repairing damages or by building water control structures. I personally favor the prepayment method; it does not cost as much, and it is devoid of human misery.

I hope that the Senate will see fit to include funds to begin construction on the Lost Creek dam and on the Siuslaw River dredging. If they do not, I shall continue my efforts in the coming year to gain support for the start of construction of these two badly needed projects.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill presents questions which our colleagues should consider most carefully. On the one hand, we have an obligation to pursue essential public works planning and construction, to provide the navigation facilities our economy requires, to furnish the protection from disastrous and costly floods our people have a right to expect, and to develop the water supplies, especially in the drought-stricken Northeastern United States, which are so fundamental in all our lives. And these are obligations which clearly belong to the Federal Government.

On the other hand, we are directly responsible for exercising an unusual degree of restraint in spending the taxpayers' money during this time of inflation. We cannot be as generous today as we have been when the price level was more stable or when the economy needed the stimulation of Government spending.

In brief, I believe we must be particularly selective—approving those projects which can only be delayed at the risk of further human or economic loss or of substantially higher costs, and postponing those which do not qualify as top priority projects.

In undertaking this responsibility, Mr. Chairman, I think we should be aware of the fact that the Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee on Public Works have performed the difficult and commendable feat of reducing the total funds appropriated in this bill by \$56 million below the administration's budget requests and \$214.5 million below last year's appropriations.

Again, however, I am convinced that the times require even greater prudence. For this reason, I intend to support an amendment or amendments providing for one or a combination of the following actions: the elimination of specific projects of relatively low priority, the striking out of all unbudgeted items, or an across-the-board reduction of all projects by from 5 to 10 percent. Such actions would save an additional \$200

million to \$400 million, without doing irreparable harm to our public works program. The last of these three alternatives would have the added value of affecting all the projects in the bill equally, including those in which each of us is personally interested.

As I have indicated, I do not believe we would be justified in voting against this bill in its entirety. The times and the state of the economy call for firm anti-inflation action, not for the radical rejection of progress in areas of such direct and lasting concern to so many of our people.

Of the items in this bill, Mr. Chairman, there are four to which I should like to devote individual attention because of their great significance to the people I represent, although I repeat that I believe a reduction in these as well as the other projects in the bill is desirable.

The first, Mr. Chairman, is the Elizabeth River project, for which funds will enable the Corps of Engineers to proceed with advance planning and design of a flood control project which will protect residents and businessmen long plagued by high water and contribute greatly to the redevelopment of the city of Elizabeth. As one who was instrumental in obtaining the first funds for this project, I am most anxious to see the work progress.

The second project is the widening of the entrance channel to Kill van Kull from Upper New York Bay, the scene of many costly accidents, and an area whose continued development is vital to the further growth of commerce in Newark Bay, especially in Port Elizabeth and Port Newark, both of which have contributed thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars to the region's economy.

The third is continuation of the comprehensive study, including reclamation, of the Jersey meadows, the largest undeveloped area in the world's greatest center of commerce and industry. The development of the meadows will have an enormously beneficial influence on the area's economy.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I refer to the special study, initiated last year by the Corps of Engineers, of the water-supply problems of the Northeastern United States. The authorization of this study last year represented what I believe can be the most significant single step in assuring a solution to the problem of drought in our intensively populated and heavily industrialized part of the Nation. For approximately 5 years, the area has suffered from inadequate supplies of clean water, and this study, hopefully, can point the way to a remedy.

Mr. KIRWAN. I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, surveys and studies of projects prior to authorization for construction, \$31,730,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$441,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17787, the Public Works Appropriation bill of 1967, and I want to specifically endorse the appropriation of funds to start construction of the Bear Creek multipurpose water control system in northwestern Alabama and northeastern Mississippi.

H.R. 17787 provides \$1,500,000 to start construction of this vitally needed project during the current fiscal year. The Congress has previously appropriated some \$756,000 for planning and design of the multipurpose system. It is estimated that the total cost to complete the project over the next 5 years will be about \$26 million.

Extensive investigations have demonstrated the engineering feasibility and economic justification for multipurpose development of the water and related land resources of the Bear Creek watershed. Bear Creek is the eighth largest tributary of the Tennessee River. Its watershed extends over portions of Colbert, Franklin, and Marion Counties in northwestern Alabama and Tishomingo County in northeastern Mississippi.

The marginal productivity of many farm and forest holdings and a labor force concentrated primarily in low-wage industries and services limit the average income, average educational levels, and living standards of Bear Creek people. A few examples might be noted: The median family income of \$2,845 in Bear Creek Watershed is only about half the national average. More than 60 percent of the people over 25 years of age dropped out of school before the ninth grade—although this ratio does not apply to the younger generation—more than 4 out of 10 families live in houses classified by the census as either dilapidated or deteriorating. Over 2,000 families or individual units in Franklin County alone receive public assistance.

It is against this background that TVA has been working for several years with the leadership of the Bear Creek area to plan and bring into being a cooperative program for economic development. This program is as broad as the resources of the area, rural and urban, physical and human.

Indigenous physical resources with potential for significantly enlarging economic opportunities are sharply limited. One of the few having such potential is the water resource, which is now underdeveloped.

The stream rises in the Bankhead National Forest of northwestern Alabama, flows about 135 miles in a general northwesterly course, and for its last 60 miles roughly follows the Alabama-Mississippi State line to the Tennessee River. In an average year Bear Creek empties 1,100,000 acre-feet of water into Pickwick Lake, enough to fill that major TVA impoundment to the top of the gates. Flow is poorly sustained during dry seasons, however, and many of the smaller streams cease entirely.

Relatively productive farmlands along creek bottoms, particularly in the western or lower half of the watershed, are subject to damage annually from one or more crop-season floods. Floods also have caused severe damage to highways and bridges, but no urban areas are in the flood plains. Rainfall averages 54 inches a year, yet the typical crop season suffers from 50 to 60 drought days.

The waters of Bear Creek at present make a rather small contribution to the watershed economy. Only 11,300 acre-feet of both ground and surface water are used. Most of the surface water used is by self-supplying mining industries; municipal use is more commonly from wells and springs which often prove inadequate for industrial or municipal expansion. During drought seasons, neither surface nor ground-water supplies are dependable for meeting any large user requirements that might develop in the upper portion of the watershed.

The 1967 estimate of \$1,500,000 provides for beginning construction work on the Bear Creek multipurpose water control system. The system will include four retention dams and reservoirs and will have flood relief for agricultural lands in the lower Bear Creek valley as its major function, but it will also be capable of a significant degree of control over Bear Creek's contribution to floods on the lower Tennessee River. Two of the reservoirs will provide needed municipal and industrial water supplies for several communities in the area. In addition, the reservoir complex is expected to provide a new base for recreation activities in the watershed.

The system is scheduled to be completed by the fall of 1970. On the basis of present plans and schedules, the estimated total cost of the system is \$26 million. Net capitalized benefits are estimated to exceed \$32,800,000.

Local interests will be expected to participate responsibly in development and management of the project, thus helping to assure that it produces the intended economic benefits to the region. Also resulting will be reductions or partial recovery of the Federal capital outlay.

I urge approval of the appropriation for Bear Creek watershed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 3, line 22, strike out "\$31,730,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$29,613,000".

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the amount of the proposed reduction in investigations for this portion of the bill, totaling \$2,117,000, is made up of two categories of projects. One of the categories is a group of investigations which were not included in the budget submitted by the President, and they number 29. There are five additional projects which were included in the budget, but for which the committee added additional study funds. So this first category of what might be termed unbudgeted investigative funds would affect 34 projects and would reduce the bill by \$1,890,000.

The second category included in this amendment is a group of projects which, in my opinion, can very well be deferred until after the Vietnam crisis has passed and when we are in a better position to proceed with this water resources development program for our country.

In the general debate on this bill, I did not list the projects which were unbudgeted but which would be affected by this amendment, since in the committee report there are footnotes which clearly identify these projects. This is one of the illuminating and fine things about the report on this bill as prepared this year.

However, the report does not set forth those projects in the budget to which I referred, and although I did list them by project in the general debate, I believe that I should repeat the list so that Members may be advised. There are 11 such projects, for which I believe investigative funds could well be deferred:

1. Illinois, Calumet River (Turning Basin).
2. Illinois, Illinois Waterway, 12 feet.
3. Illinois, Prairie du Rocher & vicinity.
4. Illinois, Shoal Creek.
5. Louisiana, Bayou Grand Caillou.
6. Michigan, Black River (Port Huron).
7. Michigan, Marquette County.
8. New York, New Rochelle and Echo Bay Harbors.
9. Ohio, Lake Erie Coast, Mich., and Ohio.
10. Ohio, Lake Erie Coast, Ohio, Pa., and N.Y.
11. Tennessee, Mill Creek.

Mr. Chairman, these projects were singled out for a number of reasons.

In one case, for instance, the project has been inactive since Korea. The study is now to be resumed. I submit to my colleagues that the same conditions which dictated the suspension of the studies at the time of Korea now prevail in this country by reason of Vietnam.

With respect to another one, which requires some explanation, Marquette County, Mich., this is a new study of water supply, water quality and recreational problems. This, I submit to my colleagues, is not a strictly Federal responsibility at this time.

There are others for which the benefit-to-cost ratio is very low. The Eel River in California and the Lytel and Warm Creeks projects are examples of this, since they barely exceed unity as a benefit to cost ratio. It would seem to me that at this time, for sure, we ought to be talking in terms of projects which can justify themselves on a very favorable benefit to cost ratio if they are to be considered for funding at this time.

The England Pond levee, for instance, has a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than one-half to 1, with a very small local contribution.

These projects, it seems to me, could well be deferred until our fiscal condition is much more favorable than at the present time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I find, with regret, that I cannot support H.R. 17787, the Public Works Appropriation bill for 1967. This is the bill, much of which is carried out by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, that is commonly called the "pork barrel" bill.

It appropriates \$4,110,932,000.

We are face to face with a very grave threat of ruinous inflation.

Under the circumstances the expenditure provided in this bill will simply help bring the fire of inflation to white hot heat.

Oh, I appreciate that the bill contains a great many worthwhile projects. But colleagues, while we are engaged in the costly struggle in Vietnam, while the dollar is under international attack, while our gold reserves are falling, while prices for necessities at home are skyrocketing, cannot these projects be deferred for a year in the interest of a more stable economy.

It is only out of the deepest concern for the welfare of the economy of the United States and the dangers which threaten it that I have become convinced I must vote against a bill which contains funds for studies in at least two projects I have favored—the Connecticut River Recreational Area Feasibility Study and that also for the so-called Dickey-Lincoln School Reservoirs project.

Most of us have become somewhat accustomed to the great danger to our country inherent in the war in Vietnam. Inflation creates an equally serious and much more insidious danger. It has been creeping up on us for sometime. Suddenly it is in our midst. The housewife feels its presence with prices up 2 percent for food in August alone. The Consumer Price Index rose 3.5 percent between January and August. It is still rising. The price of new cars will apparently be substantially increased. Interest rates on borrowed money are headed for the stratosphere.

Who is being hurt?

All Americans will suffer from the effects of this inflationary spiral but those who will be hurt first and hardest will include retired people on fixed incomes, social security beneficiaries, families of civil service and military personnel, families of low-wage income.

My colleagues, putting off the projects in this bill to a more propitious time will help curb the ruinous effects of inflation which hurt us.

This bill, amongst other things, contains 24 new construction starts not contained in the President's budget.

We have, as has the administration, asked management and labor to exercise

restraint in the pricing and wage structure of the private enterprise system. I say it is time for us to demonstrate restraint in the expenditure of the taxpayers' money—to prove that we are capable of the kind of leadership the American people have a right to expect of us.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin would reduce the general investigations appropriation from \$31,730,000 to \$29,613,000, a reduction of \$2,117,000, which appears to be a very small amount in the face of the entire budget we are considering today.

The amendment, if adopted, would affect a great number of projects all over the United States, from Maine to Florida, from Maine to California, and from Washington to Florida. There are some 26 unbudgeted items which the gentleman would cause to be knocked out of this particular general investigations section of the bill. Again, these projects are all over the United States.

There are 11 projects which are budgeted projects but which the gentleman considers to be of marginal value. These projects, too, spread throughout the United States.

These studies have all been authorized by the legislative Committee on Public Works. I believe it is elementary that we must have studies to find out if there is a feasible project for the committee to consider. This is precisely the reason why we have these studies.

Again I want to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that the amount of money involved here is relatively small, \$2,117,000, and it will take at least 4 years to complete these studies.

Now is the time to study these projects so that if they are found to be justified and if they are found to be feasible they can be authorized and they can be ready for consideration for planning funds when the time is right to expand the public works program. I believe it is absolutely indispensable that we have a backlog of studies which indicate the kinds of projects which we can go ahead on when we are able to do so.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to the very distinguished member of the authorizing committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I would like to add to the statement that the gentleman just made as to the comments of the Bureau of the Budget. When the original prospectus for a flood control or river and harbor project is received by the Committee on Public Works it carries with it the approval and endorsement of the Bureau of the Budget. Consequently the Committee on Appropriations has already had the comments of the Bureau of the Budget and the committee is properly disposing of these various projects with the Bureau of the Budget's endorsement.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join the gentleman from Massachusetts in opposition to the amendment. While I am not familiar with all of the projects included in the list, I must refer to the one which I am very familiar with. This is the Eel River project on the north coast of California. Yes, it can be said that I am protecting the projects in my district. However, I am substantially more familiar with the problems that exist there. The Eel River, when referring to benefit-cost ratio, is the river where the major floods in America took place last year. No area in the United States was harder hit by major flood damage than this area. We are dealing here with two separate projects, one in the delta and one upstream. You will hear a lot about the Eel River in the future, and I urge you to vote down the amendment, because this project must go forward. I will not take the time to elaborate on the magnitude of the projects required to bring the killer Eel under control but the Members will become increasingly familiar with it, as we present flood control recommendations in the future.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and point out to him that the Eel River is not included in this particular amendment. It will be included in an amendment he will offer on the construction item of the bill. However, may I conclude by saying that the projects which will be affected again are located all over the United States. They are in Alabama, California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Kentucky, Nebraska, and Maryland. I hope that the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and would like to specifically address my remarks to the Hollinger's Island Channel in the Mobile Harbor.

Until last year the U.S. Army owned 1,826 acres of land on the western shore of Mobile Bay where it operated an ammunition terminal during World War II and the Korean war. Periodically this facility was used by the Army Transportation Command for maneuvers. The property owned by the Army was purchased by the industrial development board of the city of Mobile and the Alabama State Docks in July 1965 from the General Services Administration to be operated as an adjunct to the port of Mobile in providing transient cargo facilities and for purposes of developing industrial sites.

The facility owned by the Army and acquired by the industrial board and the State docks is accessible to the Mobile ship channel via the Hollinger's Island ship channel, a channel dredged to the account of the Army in 1957 to a depth

of 30 feet from the Mobile ship channel to the terminal pier, a distance of 3.9 miles.

The Alabama State Docks is a State agency operating all public terminals in the port of Mobile and now operates this pier facility at the head of this channel with outbound rail and truck service. Last year the port of Mobile ship channel was dredged to 40 feet in depth with a 2-foot overcut in the final phase of the Mobile Harbor improvement authorized by the Congress in 1954. This work was accomplished by the U.S. Corps of Engineers. At the present time the port of Mobile handles 20 million tons of cargo annually and this facility is another docking point in the Mobile Harbor. The present channel to the facility from the Mobile ship channel has silted to about 15 feet in depth since the Army first dredged the channel. This requires off loading in the main channel for any cargo destined for this pier. Over the past year there have been a number of shipments that have been lightered to and from the dock.

In addition to the need for a transient cargo service at this facility the industrial board of the city of Mobile owns large industrial sites adjacent to the railroad serving the dock and the Alabama State Docks has planned to dredge a public barge canal from the dock area into the industrial property. This will be accomplished by the Alabama State Docks as a further service to the board's industrial sites. In order to provide this development the State of Alabama and the county of Mobile along with the Alabama State Docks is expending considerable funds for the construction of necessary bridges and approaches over the canal. The various utilities including the water board are at work bringing their service into this area at considerable cost. The various expenditures for improvements by local public agencies and utilities total approximately \$5 million. The industrial board has optioned 529 acres of this land to a large industry which will use imported raw materials and would need deep water access for their vessels. The Alabama State Docks will operate the pier facility and the railroad as part of the terminal operation to serve all transportation agencies and will provide in addition to the transient service the necessary service to the industries that are locating on the property.

Brookley Air Force Base, a large air materiel depot employing 13,600 civilians in Mobile, Ala., was ordered closed by the Secretary of Defense on November 19, 1964, with final phaseout to be completed in 1969. The Mobile community has worked diligently to overcome the economic impact due to the loss of this substantial number of jobs. This base was the largest Federal facility in the country closed by the Secretary of Defense in his recent phaseout activities, and payroll loss amounts to one-sixth of the total personal income in Mobile. Our people are, nevertheless, optimistic about the future and have been very active in bringing in new job opportunities for the citizens. According to the

Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce, who administers the industrial board, there are a number of large industries interested in portions of this industrial district known as Theodore Industrial District.

In order to assist the people of Mobile in pulling themselves up by their own bootstraps I urge my colleagues to approve \$25,000 for the Corps of Engineers to make a feasibility study for deepening this Hollinger's Island channel to 40 feet in depth in order to bring this water access into line with all of the other channels in the Mobile harbor. This will provide additionally needed public docks and enhance the industrial development now in progress.

I urge the appropriation at this time so that the study can move rapidly. I realize the time required for both the study and the subsequent authorization will not meet the target date for the early needed use of this terminal. In the meantime, the Alabama State Docks has committed itself to deepening to 40 feet the existing channel with a minimum width in order to have early use of the facility.

In view of this assured early use we have every reason to believe that the corps study will prove this channel to be economically feasible for completing the 40-foot channel.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], who has proposed this amendment. I understand you have read a list of those projects that would be affected by your amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I did.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If any of the other projects herein are not set forth in what you read, then they are not affected by your amendment here?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No. That is not quite correct, I will say to my colleague from Colorado. If they were unbudgeted surveys and investigations.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is as to planning?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No. We are not on planning yet. This is investigations.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. General investigations?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is all this applies to? If it is put in the budget on investigations, you do not touch it?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Unless it is on this list of 11 I have read here before. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If it deals with planning, it does not affect this?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That comes under the construction item, and that will be considered under an amendment which I propose to offer on page 4.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. On page 4 you have another amendment?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Would that amendment also apply to the planning money?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That would include planning and construction money for the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That was not budgeted?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And at that time, when you offer your next amendment on page 4, will you outline what these projects are?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I will outline the specific projects which would be affected by that amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And the amounts thereof?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I can, if questions are asked relating to it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The reason why I ask for a division of them is that there is a particular project I have in mind.

I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I rise to oppose the amendments which are being offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and to pay tribute to the honorable gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the other members of the committee who support this bill and who have done such a wonderful job in investing in America over all these years.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, the ultraliberal press have traditionally called this a pork barrel bill. They apparently do not object to expenditures administered only by some bureaucrat in one of the departments of this Government but object to Congress exercising its own judgment in determining where money should be allocated. I resent such shortsightedness.

Mr. Chairman, these projects are very carefully considered. They are not transitory in nature. They are designed to help preserve not only to this generation but to all generations of this country the resources which have made this country great.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that we owe a great debt of gratitude and thanks to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. Truly he has been a builder of a better America and we in California are extremely grateful.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on any amendment which is offered to cut these proposed items. I regret the omission of three additional unbudgeted appropriations which I sought and which I feel have great merit but I am hopeful they can be added in the Senate when certain remaining preliminary procedural hurdles have been surmounted. I refer to Kings River channel improvement and loan funds for the Pond-Poso and Buttonwillow improvement districts.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this debate, but I must clarify a point, based upon the earlier exchange between the gentleman from Wisconsin

[Mr. DAVIS] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. Chairman, on page 8 of the committee report there is an item of \$180,000 for the general investigations of the Eel River in California.

Is this included in the amendment now pending before us? As I recall, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] said that this general investigative item of \$180,000 on the Eel River is not included in the amendment but that it would be included in the planning and construction item deletion amendment. Is this correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct. It will come through a subsequent amendment. It is not covered in the pending amendment.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. So, I can rest assured that this particular item, the \$180,000 item, will not be struck if the proposed amendment is adopted?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Not by this pending amendment; this is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF
WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: Page 3, line 22, strike out "\$31,730,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$29,840,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to deal only with one of the categories included in the previous amendment which was just rejected. That previous amendment, had it been adopted, would have stricken from the bill those studies, resurrections and reports which had not been included in the President's budget and would also delete 11 additional projects which had been in the budget but which, at least, in my opinion could not be justified at this time—critical fiscal time.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the Clerk has read applies only to the first category. In other words, it applies only to the deletion of unbudgeted new studies, resurrections and increases in budget studies. It involves \$1,890,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Massachusetts, one of the very competent and more informed members of this subcommittee, has said, in connection with the previous amendment, this does not involve a great deal of money.

But I do think it goes more deeply than that, both with respect to our fiscal situation and with respect to this particular program. These studies do take up the trained personnel of the Corps of Engineers. If we are not receiving the trained personnel of the Corps of Engineers in directing these studies, we had better not be making them at all. But if to the extent they do take up the trained personnel of the Corps of Engineers, to that extent this trained personnel being used for this civilian purpose is in competition for the trained personnel that we so badly need not only for the billion

dollar military construction program which passed this House this past week, but for the other military engineering projects for which the Corps of Engineers is responsible in the combat areas in which American troops are engaged. I think this is a great deal more important to us than the dollars involved.

This amendment is designed to retrench, to curtail the investigative functions of the Corps of Engineers for their civilian purposes in order that trained personnel will be available—and there is a scarcity of trained personnel in this respect—so they will be available for the military responsibilities of our country.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RESNICK. The gentleman mentioned 11 projects. Would the gentleman be good enough to name the 11 projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I have already mentioned them twice. Would it be helpful if I mentioned that none of the 11 projects are in the State of New York—would that answer the question the gentleman had in mind?

Mr. RESNICK. That would be very helpful.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] rise?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin would affect, as he has indicated, just the unbudgeted items and the increases in the budgeted items. As he indicated, it amounts to a total of \$1,890,000.

His first amendment would have attacked all the items with which he was displeased in the unbudgeted items, the increases in the budgeted items, and that would have totaled \$2,117,000. But in order to get at the unbudgeted items and the increases in the budgeted items, it was necessary for him to offer this amendment that is now before us.

This amendment, would affect a number of projects throughout the United States.

Let me say, it would seem to me there ought to be some power vested in this committee that the subcommittee on appropriations should have some responsibility on deciding on projects, and that is precisely what we did with respect to the unbudgeted items and also the increases in the budgeted items.

This committee listened to 1,600 witnesses. It held hearings for a period of 9 months. There were over 180 Members of Congress alone who came before the committee seeking increases in budgeted items or seeking appropriations for unbudgeted items.

So, I do not think I can emphasize too strongly, Mr. Chairman, this committee should have the right, not alone the Bureau of the Budget downtown, but this committee that sat for so long and

has listened to so many witnesses, that it should have the right to put in some of the items which it, in its wisdom and judgment, believes ought to be in this bill.

If we follow the recommendation of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], we will be saying that we do not have this right and it ought to be given to the bureaucrats downtown.

So I think this amendment, Mr. Chairman, ought to be defeated.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I simply want to say to my colleague from Massachusetts, for whom I have the greatest respect because of his responsible work on this committee, that I do not advocate the turning over of this power or decision to the Bureau of the Budget as a permanent proposition. I would be among the first to assert the responsibility as well as the authority of this committee to institute new general investigations of its own. But I am attempting by this suggestion to find means for installing a formula for dealing with what I consider to be a very critical fiscal situation in this country. I suggest it only as an emergency formula for this fiscal year and during the Vietnam war in which we are now engaged and not as a permanent practice for this committee.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]. Let me say there is no more valued, no more hard-working member of that committee.

He is in constant attendance. He does a thorough job in interrogation of witnesses. I am sure that he, no more than any one of us, in fact, would want to turn this whole job over to the Bureau of the Budget, but the fact is that that is precisely what the amendment would do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF
WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: Page 3, line 22, strike out "\$31,730,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$31,503,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is the second category to which I referred. It was not included in the immediately preceding amendment. It was included in the first amendment which I offered at this point in the bill. This refers now to a reduction of \$227,000 for 11 specific general investigations which I have twice read to the Members of this Committee.

It would involve, for example, a project which has been inactive since Korea. It would involve one study of local water supply and recreational problems, which I do not feel is a Federal responsibility. It would involve a couple of projects with

particularly low benefit-to-cost ratios. It would involve one or two projects for which the justification is primarily recreational, and the justifications so show.

I agree that while under different circumstances we might all want to take a different attitude, I feel that it is important to pinpoint these items as being unjustified at this particular time.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This is the second part of the summary amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin which the Committee has already defeated. As he has indicated, this is an amendment which would reduce this item by \$227,000, and this is a list of budgeted projects which he considers to be of marginal value. I would leave to the judgment of the Members of this Committee as to whether or not these projects are of marginal value.

A great number of these projects, or some of the projects, are projects which are harbors of refuge located in Michigan, Ohio, and New York. Some of them are recreation, some flood control, and some are beach erosion projects.

Again, this amendment would affect some projects that are in States all over the country. As I have indicated, we have already defeated the original package amendment and this amendment is part of that. It was part of the original amendment originally offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. It would appear to me that we should stand by the earlier judgment. I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to express my own disappointment over the fact that the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Appropriations Committee failed to appropriate the comparatively small amount of \$250,000 for a national cemetery program, as I had requested.

In the State of New Jersey a cemetery for veterans known as Beverly Cemetery has been obliged to close. If we could have an extra \$125,000, we could reopen that in fiscal year 1967, and we could obtain the site necessary to provide final resting places for veterans whose families want them buried in a veterans cemetery.

I know my colleagues from New Jersey on both sides of the aisle share my regret. I express the hope that if the other body should include this item, the conferees could see fit to accept their recommendation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, President Roosevelt once said that the most important task facing our people, other than protecting ourselves in a major war, was to leave a better country for our children than the one we found.

Mr. Chairman, I pay tribute to our great friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for his untiring efforts to achieve President Roosevelt's statement of purpose. All of us in this House are proud to acknowledge the outstanding contributions of the gentleman from Ohio to America the beautiful. Generations to come will have a better, more lovely country, both economically and in natural beauty, because of the efforts of MIKE KIRWAN.

But Mr. Chairman, there is so much that can be done by the rest of us who are devoted to the same task. Americans have been careless—much too careless—with their bountiful heritage. Polluted streams and waterways, foul air, auto junkyards, careless fires, scattered refuse have hurt almost irreparably America the beautiful. I was talking a short time ago to a Member who had just returned from a visit to our national parks.

The parks are wonderful—

He said—

but do you know what would do more than anything else for the scenic beauty of America?

I shook my head.

Giving a penny back on every beer can—

He replied.

Advancing civilization brings its penalties. Where shall we dispose of our empty bottles and cans, our refuse, our atomic wastes, our industrial and national pollutants?

We who live on Lake Michigan are very much concerned—understandably—with any practice or activity that results in pollution of our lake. For some time the Corps of Army Engineers has been dumping its dredgings from rivers and waterways right into the middle of Lake Michigan, without regard to the question of whether such dredgings add to the pollution of the lake. Yes, we want the dredging. We want improvements to our harbors and our waterways. But we do not want such improvements to result in fouling the waters of the lake.

And, Mr. Chairman, it is contended by officials of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago that such dredgings do pollute Lake Michigan.

I was prepared, Mr. Chairman, to offer an amendment to this bill to prevent disposing of polluted dredgings in Lake Michigan. However, upon checking with the Corps of Army Engineers, I was advised that the corps had been engaged for some time in studying alternative methods of getting rid of the dredging wastes. That study is almost completed, and it is confidently expected that an alternative will be found. It will inevitably be more expensive. Dumping the dredgings into the lake is less costly financially. But, Mr. Chairman, the easy way, the cheap way is not necessarily the best way. There is only one Lake Michigan. There is only one system of Great Lakes, and they must be protected from further pollution. I intend to stay in close touch with the corps to make sure that its polluting practices are discontinued.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, or projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); \$953,715,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That \$550,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 4, line 14, strike out "\$953,715,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$919,330,000".

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment includes three categories of proposed deletions. It is in this phase of the bill, I believe to which the gentleman from Massachusetts referred as a summary amendment with respect to the earlier paragraph on investigations. In other words, this includes all three of the categories where I believe reductions should be made.

The first category would represent a reduction of \$30 million to delete unbudgeted new planning and construction starts, resummptions and increases in budgeted amounts. Here again, I would refer the members of the committee to the very adequate committee report, in which the unbudgeted items for planning and construction are indicated by footnotes. I would further advise my colleagues from California, who made inquiry a minute ago, that this Eel River, as I will mention in another category, is included in this overall amendment.

The second category in this amendment refers to a group of budgeted projects which in my opinion could very well be deferred at this time. They include: In California, the Eel River for planning; in California, the Lytel and Warm Creeks for planning; in Florida, the Ponce de Leon Inlet for planning; in Illinois, the Richland Creek for construction; in Kentucky, the Paintsville Reservoir, for planning; in New Jersey, the Atlantic City reimbursement, for beach erosion control; in Oklahoma, the Lukfata Reservoir, for planning; in Virginia, the Virginia Beach reimbursement, for beach

erosion; in West Virginia, the Burnsville Reservoir, for planning; in West Virginia, the R. D. Bailey Reservoir, for construction; in Maine, the Dickey-Lincoln School project, for planning; in Kentucky, the Martin's Fork Reservoir, for planning; in Texas, the Trinity River, for planning; in Colorado, the Trinidad Reservoir, for construction; and in Illinois, the England Pond levee, for construction.

I would submit, Mr. Chairman, with respect to each and every one of these 15 projects, that while good cases can be made for their construction at some time, that there is not that immediate urgency about them which would justify proceeding with them at a time when retrenchment ought to be the order of the day for civilian construction projects.

The third category included in this amendment is a group of five projects which are budgeted but which must justify themselves at least 50 percent or more as the basis of recreation benefits. These would include: In Florida, Virginia Key and Key Biscayne, for construction; in Hawaii, Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, for construction; in Hawaii, Honokahau Harbor, for planning purposes; in North Carolina, Ocracoke Island, for planning purposes; and in Missouri, Smithville Reservoir, for planning purposes.

There may come a time when we will feel that we can proceed with these projects on the basis of their recreational value, but I do not believe this is the time. I believe this represents a breach of faith with those who are depending upon us for some very urgent appropriations at this time, keeping in mind that if we spend this money for this purpose we shall have to delete some projects for this Government somewhere else or borrow the money with which to provide for them.

I submit, therefore, that the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I direct the gentleman's attention to page 26 of the report, to the items for Colorado. There is listed Chatfield Reservoir. There is a budgeted item of \$481,000. Also, there has been approved by the committee for construction \$5,519,000. The planning figure is \$481,000.

Would the gentleman's amendment affect the planning money?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

(On request of Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Would the gentleman's amendment affect either of those items; and, if so, which one?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The amendment which I have offered would affect the construction money. It would not affect the planning money of \$481,000, which was included in the budget.

I believe this is justified not only on the grounds that it was not in the budget but also, I suggest, because if there is that much planning which remains to be done

it is highly questionable whether they would be in a position to go ahead efficiently and economically with construction during the fiscal year.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If, as an example, \$5 million of that were for the purchase of land to go along with the planning, would the amendment apply to that?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It would affect it, because that would be considered as construction funds not included in the budget.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an attack upon the construction part of the public works appropriations bill. It is made for the purpose of deleting unbudgeted new planning and construction starts, resumptions, increases in budgeted amounts, and budgeted projects with recreational benefits in excess of 50 percent, and new budgeted projects of marginal value. It comes to a total of some \$34 million.

As the gentleman has said, this is his first amendment. It is the overall inclusive amendment which includes all the projects he believes ought not to be carried in this particular bill this year.

If this amendment is defeated, the gentleman will offer another amendment; and if that amendment is defeated, he will offer another. The two subsequent amendments will cover parts of the amendment the gentleman now offers.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECREST. Would this amendment cover the North Branch Reservoir on the Kokosing River?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes. This amendment would cut that out.

Mr. SECREST. I want to oppose the amendment. This is one of the most important projects in Ohio. I believe the amendment should be defeated. For over a year I have worked for this project. I do not want to see it killed here on the floor of the House by this amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the gentleman's joining me. I think that any Member with a project here would be interested in defeating the amendment.

These projects have been given consideration by the Subcommittee on Public Works. The chairman of the subcommittee spent many long hours on this bill.

We increased those projects which we believed were entitled to an increase.

As the gentleman from Colorado has said—and he has been supported in his belief on this by his colleagues, the gentlemen from Colorado [Mr. McVicker and Mr. Evans]—Chatfield Dam is one that would be affected by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. It would reduce the Chatfield Dam appropriation by \$5,519,000.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I have seen a better case made for an increase in a budgeted project than was made by

the Members of Congress from Colorado plus all the distinguished citizens from the Denver area.

That not only applies to Chatfield but to a place like Dubuque, Iowa. I remember the able Member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER], coming before the committee to testify with a distinguished group of citizens from Dubuque. Now, this is strictly a flood control project which is attuned solely to the preservation of lives and property and preventing damage. The distinguished Member from the State of Iowa who represents that district [Mr. CULVER], came before the committee and made a very persuasive case for this project. This is the kind of a project which will be eliminated here. The increase in the budget for construction of this project will be eliminated if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin prevails. These projects affected are all over this country. They affect every State and are in every nook and corner of the Nation. Most of them apply to flood control.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CULVER. I wish to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding. I would like to express my appreciation for his kind references to the community of Dubuque and to our efforts to secure passage of this legislation so that we can obtain this very much needed project.

I rise in opposition to this amendment and express my appreciation to the chairman and the members of the Committee on Appropriations for their dedicated efforts on behalf of our area.

Mr. Chairman, the farsighted, wise, and gifted leadership of Chairman KIRWAN over the years has made possible the development of water and power supply, flood control, navigation, and reclamation public works projects so fundamental to the present strength and future progress of America.

Mr. Chairman, it is a source of personal gratification to me that the Appropriations Committee has approved our request for funds to complete the planning of the Dubuque flood control project and to begin construction of this floodwall in the coming year.

For much too long a time, the city of Dubuque has suffered through ravaging floods of the Mississippi River, constructing and removing temporary protective measures which can at best be only partially effective, restoring public facilities, repairing damaged property, and generally cleaning up in the wake of the flood.

Back in 1944, the city received the necessary congressional authority to begin planning for a permanent flood protection device, but it was not until fiscal year 1964 that the first Federal appropriations were made for this planning. This year, the President's budget included \$145,000 to complete the planning stages of the project, but the hopes for funds to at least start construction of the floodwall were diminished when no further budget request for this purpose was made.

The continual threat of flooding on the Mississippi is a constant concern to business, industries, and government in Dubuque and problems arise concerning insurance rates, new industry location, business expansion and construction in the rather heavily industrialized section of the city most seriously affected.

A recent study of a respected research organization reveals that 94 percent of a representative cross section of Dubuque residents consider a permanent means of flood protection to be the most important pending community project. In addition, they overwhelmingly indicated their willingness to approve a bond issue to finance the city's share of the cost of such a facility.

On the basis of my personal observations during the disastrous flood of 1965, and my work with Dubuque officials since that time, I can testify with the greatest conviction to the need for immediate action to provide effective flood protection in the area.

Plans for the 1965 floods—drawn up as early as 1962—were put into effect on April 1 of that year, almost a full month before the floodwaters crested. All city forces and 3,500 volunteers worked to minimize the damage of the floodwaters, filling and putting into place 350,000 sandbags and operating 141 trucks and bulldozers on a 24-hour basis. Red Cross, civil defense, and the Salvation Army supplied staff and support services; the Corps of Engineers provided full-time technical advisers; the Coast Guard patrolled the river with 26 men; and the National Guard patrolled the dikes. The cleanup began on May 1 and continued through the month of August.

This outstanding effort is credited with preventing damage to an estimated \$19 million worth of property. But another \$8 million was lost in the flood. Beyond this, the Corps of Engineers estimates that an additional \$7 million in damages have been incurred as a result of floods in Dubuque dating back to 1938.

Every year that completion of the project is delayed poses a very real threat of adding to the already enormous costs which the city and individual Dubuque residents have endured.

It is for this reason that we have worked this year to secure not only the recommended funds to finish planning, but an additional \$105,000 to begin the construction of the floodwall in 1967. By gaining approval for these funds, we can accelerate the timetable for completion of this vital project and provide permanent protection for more than \$80 million worth of property from any future flooding of the Mississippi.

I want to express my appreciation to the Dubuque community leaders, Mayor Walter Pregler, City Engineer John L. White, Dubuque Packing Co. Representative Andrew Kisting, and Attorney Francis J. O'Connor, who came to Washington to testify with me before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. It was their efforts, and the support of the residents of the city, which made clear the urgency of this undertaking and re-

sulted in the approval of the House Appropriations Committee.

I realize that at a time of budgetary pressures, we must postpone new starts on projects which can be deferred temporarily. But there is no question as to the priority which the Dubuque project must receive.

I am also aware that the committee heard testimony from over 1,600 witnesses requesting funds for unbudgeted projects and to increase the amounts on budgeted projects. This included nearly 200 Members of Congress involving over 300 projects.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to defeat this amendment and support the committee judgment that this critical flood control project is of the highest priority and fully justified, by approving the entire \$250,000 included for Dubuque in the appropriations bill now before this body.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for those kind remarks.

May I again emphasize that if anyone knows how seriously this amendment would affect this particular area, it is the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, I am now delighted to yield to the gentleman from Atlantic City, N.J. [Mr. McGRATH].

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, which would prevent the reimbursement of Atlantic City in the amount of \$150,000 for a beach-erosion project. This was a budgeted item intended to reimburse Atlantic City for work already done. It is an authorized Federal project and Atlantic City went ahead with this work in the obvious belief that the Federal Government would reimburse the city.

This project has a very favorable benefit-cost ratio of 2.9 to 1. The total estimated project cost is \$9,160,000 of which \$4,010,000 is the estimated Federal cost.

The justification for authorization of this project is as follows:

Atlantic City is one of the most popular seaside resorts on the Atlantic coast. The economic life of the city is largely based upon the preservation of the beach for recreational purposes. The authorized work is necessary to maintain a suitable beach for recreational purposes and for protection of the boardwalk and properties fronting the ocean and Absecon Inlet.

The city has completed more than 40 percent of the work in accordance with the authorized plan and has been reimbursed for the Federal share of costs incurred through fiscal year 1963. Current operations are confined to the 4,800-foot stone jetty extending seaward from Brigantine Island which is vital to the protection of navigation using Absecon Inlet. A total of 2,550 feet was completed through 1958 in four increments. A 400-foot extension costing \$310,000 was completed in September 1964 and the Federal share of \$155,000 will be reimbursed to the city out of funds available for fiscal year 1966. The balance of fiscal year 1966 funds will be used for partial payment of the Federal share of the cost of a further 350-foot increment of jetty construction started in November 1965 with completion scheduled in June 1966.

Last year, Atlantic City was reimbursed in the amount of \$200,000 for this

work by the Public Works Appropriations Act of 1966.

I urge the Members to defeat this amendment. I commend the distinguished chairman and the members of his committee for bringing such a fine appropriations bill to the House floor.

Mr. BOLAND. I can understand why the gentleman from New Jersey is concerned about this, because it will eliminate a beach-erosion-control project in New Jersey, which has already committed itself to the expenditure of more than \$5 million. This is a reimbursement project, and they are entitled to be reimbursed for it. All other parts of the Nation which have this kind of a project have been reimbursed for it, and there is no reason why New Jersey should not be.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join the gentleman from Massachusetts in opposition to this amendment. While previous reference has been made to other projects, I would like again to devote some attention to this so-called Eel River Delta project. To give you some idea of the problems we are facing, I am personally convinced that the benefit-cost ratio of this project will have to be altered in the future, because while it is now listed with a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.1 to 1, I would remind you that during the 1964 floods there was \$7 million spent on flood disaster recovery and rehabilitation costs by the Corps of Engineers in the Eel River Canyon and Delta alone. This does not include the ASCS reseeding program. On the north coast of California we have 40 percent of the water for the entire State and we have a history of annual floods occurring there. I am the ranking Republican of the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works which is going to look into this matter of benefit-to-cost ratio next year. The chairman and I have discussed this problem and will be asking many of you to join us and our Committee on Public Works in looking into this entire benefit-cost ratio question, because in the long run, I believe we will save a great deal of money.

I am convinced the existing benefit-to-cost ratio is outdated. I have described it as horse and buggy in its approach to the financial and benefit facts of life.

The gentleman from Wisconsin raises a good point that more justifying information needs to be provided to the committee on these projects. I can assure him that this will be the intent of our committee when we conduct the hearings on benefit-to-cost ratio evaluation next year.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from California and will say that what he says is precisely true. The author of this amendment objects to this project because it has a benefit-cost ratio of only 1.1 to 1. That was true, as the gentleman from California indicated, in 1954. But here it is 1964. They have had floods since then. There has been a great loss

of life last year and the year before. The area lost 24 lives and spent \$7 million in the area. This, of course, brings this to much better than a 1.1 to 1 benefit-cost ratio now.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts yielding to me.

I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I would like to point out to the House that this amendment will delete from the bill the Chagrin River project in my district. This is a flood control project which is badly needed in the western half of Lake County, Ohio. In recent years several people have lost their lives due to the flooding of the Chagrin River.

It would also delete from the bill \$200,000 for the widening and deepening of the outer channel of Ashtabula Harbor.

Mr. Chairman, I would also at this time like to express my reservation concerning the Lake Erie to Ohio River Canal. In voting for the public works appropriations bill of 1967, I will not be voting for the approval of this project at this time for the following reasons:

First. This project received the approval of the Corps of Engineers Rivers and Harbors Committee only last week. In the last paragraph of their report they said as follows:

The Board report is being processed to the Chief of Engineers, who in turn will transmit his proposed report, together with the reports of the Board and the reporting officers, to the Governors of the affected States and to interested Federal agencies for their views and comments. These comments will accompany the complete report to Congress with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

I am firmly convinced that this project should have followed these channels before additional money was asked for engineering. It is my duty to represent my district to the best of my ability. Involved in this project, according to the Corps of Engineers, is \$95 million in first cost local participation funds. Many of these millions of dollars will have to come from the counties of Lake and Ashtabula in the State of Ohio. These costs and those that will be sustained by the State of Ohio should have been thoroughly examined before additional planning money was allocated.

I am also concerned with the Corps of Engineers report that states:

Prior to construction—
Local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will:

a. Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction and subsequent maintenance of the navigation features of the project, except in the Grand River Reservoir and the divide cut, and for aids to navigation upon the request of the Chief of Engineers, including suitable areas determined by the Chief of Engineers to be required in the general public interest for initial and subsequent disposal of spoil, and also necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments therefor or the costs of such retaining works;

b. Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction, operation, and maintenance of the navigation features including, but not limited to, those resulting from wave action and changes in ground-water levels;

c. Bear a proportionate share of the cost of bridge alterations over the existing channels of the Beaver, Mahoning, and Grand Rivers in accordance with the principles of Section 6 of Public Law 647, Seventy-sixth Congress (Truman-Hobbs Act), as amended;

d. Assume all obligations of owning, including operating, maintaining, and replacing, all railway and highway bridges altered or constructed as part of the multipurpose project, including any additional costs of maintenance or operation which may be required because of the project, with such obligations for each bridge being assumed upon completion of the alteration or construction of that bridge;

e. Provide and maintain, at local expense, terminal and transfer facilities along the waterway and at a Lake Erie terminus adequate to handle the commerce which will use the waterway, with depths in berthing areas and local access channels serving the navigation channel commensurate with the depths provided in related project areas; with terminal facilities at Lake Erie open to all on equal terms.

Before I could give my approval to this project, I believe it is my duty to protect the local political subdivisions from this tremendous expense. In any case, no approval can be given by me until such time as the State of Ohio assures our local subdivisions that they stand ready to provide the non-Federal funds that would be eventually needed at the time of construction.

It is also my firm belief, Mr. Chairman, that this project will never be built without the approval of the Boards of County Commissioners of Ashtabula and Lake Counties. These bodies hold the key to the eventual construction of the canal.

At the present time I do not believe that the benefits to be derived in my district outweigh the tremendous immediate cost to our local taxpayers. I will hold this position until assurances to the contrary are given to me by either the State of Ohio or the Federal Government that non-Federal funds be provided at least in part by other than local taxpayers of Ashtabula and Lake Counties.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me and rise to express my opposition to the amendment.

I will not impose on the time of the House to discuss the tremendous benefits that have sprung from development of the natural resources of this Nation.

Each of you are well aware of the great strides we have taken in creative resources development throughout most of the United States.

We have also helped to build huge hydro projects in underdeveloped countries of the world such as the 370-foot-high dam on the Volta River in Ghana which provides West Africa with 1 million kilowatts of electricity.

Yet, for some strange reason, Maine and New England have been bypassed as the natural resources of other areas of the United States and abroad have been developed.

Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall has called the Dickey-Lincoln School project a "great water resource project in the classic sense" and he also termed it "a model for conservation" in that it provides complete and comprehensive development of the international St. John River.

Two engineering agencies of our Government—the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Interior—participated jointly in preparing the engineering and economic feasibility studies of this project. The Federal Power Commission considers it the finest hydroelectric site in New England. President Johnson personally transmitted the report on the project to Congress to demonstrate his strong support of the Dickey-Lincoln School project. And finally, Congress in the last session authorized its construction. Now another feasibility study will be undertaken; and while the proponents do not believe it is necessary, we hope it will serve to reassure those still with doubts.

Mr. Chairman, the Dickey-Lincoln School project has impressive credentials as a resource development project; and I am at a loss to understand the continuing attempts to block the legitimate interests of the people of New England.

New England suffers from the highest cost electric power in the continental United States. In Maine, electric rates for the average consumer are 21 percent higher than the national average. In fact, the average monthly bill for the same amount of electric power increased from 1964 to 1965—while it was decreasing throughout the rest of the Nation.

Now, when a solid promise of help is offered to the people of New England, selfish private-interest groups continue to seek to obstruct it. Secretary Udall has called upon them to cooperate in this great endeavor, citing the advantages of mutual cooperation, but they refused. The gentleman from Maine, Congressman HATHAWAY, and I have sought their cooperation without avail. Instead they hold out only promises designed to confuse the issues and thwart the will of Congress.

The private power companies have two approaches. In New England they say that construction of the Dickey-Lincoln School project would prevent them from going forward with their so-called nuclear alternative. In Washington, however, they say that the Dickey-Lincoln School is unnecessary because of their firm intentions to construct their nuclear alternative.

The Federal Power Commission, following the presentation of these utilities before the House Public Works Committee last year, reviewed their so-called nuclear alternative. The Commission concluded that it was not, in fact, a cheaper alternative. They found instead that power produced under this so-called alternative was 41.8 percent higher in terms of cost per kilowatt-year

and 52.6 percent higher in terms of capacity costs.

The small municipal systems and rural cooperatives in Maine pay these utilities 15 to 20 mills for electric power. Power from the Dickey-Lincoln School project would be sold at 8 mills. Think what this will mean in Calais, Maine, for example, where the streets are illuminated by 25-watt bulbs. You have no idea what this project means in terms of area redevelopment in Aroostook and Washington Counties where nearly half of the people live on incomes clearly below the poverty level.

For those who are apprehensive over the cost of this project, let me remind them that for every dollar of Federal investment an additional \$2 of private business transactions will be generated.

A study made by the Department of the Interior of electric power needs in the region showed that 36 million kilowatts of generating power would be needed in New England and Canada's Maritime Provinces by 1980. After deducting existing capacity and planned additions, the Federal Power Commission estimates there will be a deficit of 17 million kilowatts. I think prudent men would agree that New England needs both nuclear plants and the Dickey-Lincoln School project. It is not a case of one against the other; actually, substantially more low-cost electric power is needed in New England than both can provide.

I hope that my Republican colleagues will join in bipartisan support of the Maine project. I would remind them that this project has the support of Republican Gov. John Reed, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and the last Republican State convention in my State.

Mr. Chairman, in nearly 16 years of public life—here and in Maine—I can think of no single project which is more important to the future of my State. In my 6 years in Congress, I have consistently supported the development of water resources of this Nation no matter where they were located because I am convinced that prudent investment in our resources is also a prudent investment in the future of our country. I ask only that you do for the people of Maine that which they have willingly supported for the citizens of other States for many years.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, you know that they say a freshman should be seen and not heard. I have been on this distinguished committee for only a short time. Like many, before I had the opportunity to join this distinguished Committee on Appropriations and this particular subcommittee, I wondered how they operated. The distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, as you know, is one of the most respected and honored Members of this House. He has friends galore by reason of that fact.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would be much bigger if MIKE KIRWAN had his way and if he had not used the restraint that he thought was necessary at this time.

But, by the same token, as the gentleman has said over and over again, he

believes in the future of the country and in the development of the resources of this country and in what is going to keep it great.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] believes that we should maintain advanced planning and continue construction; he believes we should maintain flood control and the development of our natural resources for the benefit of all people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman on the other side of the aisle wants to cut out the unbudgeted items. Mind you, if your committee had just limited itself to the budgeted items, someone—I do not know who on this side of the aisle—but someone over there would have wanted to cut it below the budget, saying that the Bureau of the Budget did not know what it was talking about, and that it was too extravagant.

On the one hand, Mr. Chairman, they want to adhere to what the Bureau of the Budget says. And, if you do, that is too much.

I want to tell the Members of the Committee that every item that is contained herein has been carefully considered by this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is a great honor to join this distinguished committee, on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has offered this amendment, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], there is not a more dedicated man on this committee than the gentleman from Wisconsin. But by the same token he will admit that every item was gone into thoroughly.

By the same token, Mr. Chairman, can anyone tell us that this will not be needed to be done later on? The gentleman just wants to postpone it, because he wants you to tighten the belt a little tighter.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that this subcommittee has tightened the belt just as tight as we can make it.

Mr. Chairman, we must maintain plans ahead. If we stop all future planning, if we stop all items of construction, all of those items that have been approved, when we finish this war undertakings, we will not be in a position to move ahead.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has done an excellent job. He has restrained himself in what he believes is needed for this country. He is to be commended for that and I believe he has brought out a bill that none of you should turn down, that none of you should delete any item of it, because the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] is a man who believes in America. This bill represents the belief of the gentleman from Ohio in a greater America. And, mind you, I want to repeat the fact that it would have been much larger if the gentleman from Ohio had had his way.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which is now being proposed, and those that will come later, being offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], if they had had any merit, we would have cut them out in the committee.

Mr. Chairman, we have a tight committee. Had they had no merit MIKE

KIRWAN would have cut them out, because he is a gentleman who believes and knows that we must practice some restraint, and by the same token, he does not want to see this country throttled in the development of its great resources by any niggardly type of restraint.

MIKE KIRWAN is a builder of America and I urge you to join with me in rejecting this amendment and be a builder with him.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join a number of my New England colleagues in applauding the action taken by the Appropriations Committee in reference to the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School project.

In my opinion the continuing search for information on this project can only benefit the taxpayers of the Nation at a time when they deserve our utmost attention.

It seems clear enough to me that the Federal agencies that have been stumping for this project can have no legitimate objection to such a thorough analysis before we are asked for construction moneys. This project has been so enveloped with controversy, claim, and counterclaim and conflicting information that we would be doing a genuine disservice to the people of New England, and the Nation as well, not to seek the true facts.

By involving at the outset the full searching powers of the Appropriations Committee we can seek answers anywhere and everywhere, from the Atomic Energy Commission to the Federal Power Commission, from the many statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the engineering studies made by private firms. We should seek and probe and ask until all the answers are in and then—and only then—should this House be asked to make a decision on this tremendously costly project.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is a shocking fact that in the face of today's expanding naval needs some of our great carriers cannot enter the harbor of one of our major naval bases because of an inadequate entrance. Almost equally shocking is the fact the movement of Navy ships into and out of this harbor is impeded to the point where special permission must be obtained on weekends at times before a Navy vessel can enter or leave the harbor.

This situation exists at San Diego, Calif., and is caused by the fact that the single entrance to the harbor is too narrow and too shallow to meet the needs of the major naval base there.

San Diego Harbor is one of the 10 best natural harbors in the world. Unfortunately, at present there is only one entrance, and that entrance is only 600 feet wide. In addition to the vast number of Navy vessels berthed in the harbor, and using this entrance, there are 13,000 other boats of all sizes from pleasure craft to commercial fishermen registered in San Diego County, most of

which use that entrance from time to time. The congestion is tremendous, and increasing. It is complicated further because six changes of course are required to negotiate the channel by large ships.

Even worse, at low tide large carriers cannot enter the harbor at all. This is because the depth of the entrance is only 42 feet. The large carriers have a draft of 37 feet, with sonar equipment extending another 5 feet or more below the hulls.

It is impossible to dredge a deeper entrance because the floor of the harbor is at bedrock. Already in view by the Navy are vessels which will have a draft greater than 42 feet. These ships, which will be among the most important the Navy has, will not be able to use one of the Navy's greatest harbors under present conditions. Other Navy vessels are already denied use of the harbor for reasons having nothing to do with depth of the water. They are nuclear-powered vessels of the future, which will not be permitted to dock in the harbor because there is insufficient circulation, or flushing action, of the harbor waters with only one entrance.

A major training operation of the Navy loses tens of thousands of man-hours a month because of inadequate access to training facilities. These are amphibious training operations off the shore of the base on the ocean side. To reach the scene of these training operations, boats and men must make a circuitous route through the present harbor entrance.

The harbor could be made available for use by all Navy ships of whatever size, whether nuclear powered or not, congestion could be eased and unhampered entry and exit for Navy vessels made possible, and thousands of training man-hours saved, by construction of a second entrance to San Diego Bay. The Army Engineers have begun a study to determine the feasibility of such an entrance. In the bill before us is an appropriation of \$165,000 for continuation of that study.

To meet the expanding needs of our Navy, a second entrance to the harbor is a necessity. So great is this need that it even overshadows the purely commercial benefits such a second entrance would provide for Metropolitan San Diego. The city's growth as a major west coast port is hindered now by its inadequate harbor entrance. There are already 75 oceangoing freighters which cannot use the port of San Diego because of the shallow harbor entrance. With every country turning to larger and larger freighters, more and more ships will have to turn away from one of the major cities on the west coast unless a second and deeper entrance is made into San Diego Bay.

Civilian needs present a forceful argument in favor of such an entrance, but great as they are, they are overridden by the pressing and increasing needs of the Navy.

The budgeting of funds for this harbor study is of vital importance to the Navy and to our national defense.

A prominent retired Navy officer told me recently of meeting with the late

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, aboard the President's car on a railroad siding in San Diego during the year 1944.

Displaying an unusual and detailed knowledge of our harbor—stemming, no doubt, from his days as Assistant Secretary of the Navy—Mr. Roosevelt asked:

By the way, when are you going to cut that second entrance?

The question is being asked now with greater frequency.

I hope my colleagues, by their votes today, will provide a clue to the answer.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We in the First District of Alabama are always interested in and aware of the continuing value of the Coosa-Alabama River system because its terminus is at the port city of Mobile.

Much of the traffic on this river system is handled in one way or another at Mobile. The cargoes transported on this system contribute a great deal to the economy of Alabama.

I give my unqualified support to four budgeted items for development of the Coosa-Alabama River system, with a total amount of \$32,600,000.

They include \$13,500,000 for continuing construction of the Millers Ferry Dam near Camden, \$7,500,000 for continuing construction of the Claiborne lock and dam near Monroeville, \$3 million for continuing construction of the Jones Bluff lock and dam further upstream, all three of these projects located on the Alabama River.

The fourth item of the group is the Carters flood and power dam on the Coosa River near Rome, Ga., where \$8,600,000 is budgeted for continuing construction there.

In addition, I want to call attention to the request for the unbudgeted amount of \$800,000 covered in the gentleman's amendment, for the beginning of the Alabama River channel improvement in the 82 miles of the river below the Claiborne lock and dam. This is essential if the dams I have mentioned are to become operative.

In fiscal 1966 funds were appropriated for planning of this project. The locks in the Claiborne Dam and in the Millers Ferry Dam are scheduled to be placed in operation in December 1967. It is important that the channel improvement be completed, also, at that time, if year-around navigation is to be possible in this area of the river.

With completion of these projects the Coosa-Alabama River system will be open for navigation a total distance of 325 miles from Mobile to the Jordan Dam No. 2. This will be truly a remarkable achievement, one that has been dreamed of and sought by forward-looking men for many years.

It is hoped that the goal will be reached by 1970. It will bring added economic strength to all citizens in the area.

This river system is the second largest south of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi. It drains wholly or partially 43 counties in Alabama and Georgia and covers about 38 percent of the State of Alabama. The system is considered one

of the greatest undeveloped natural resources in the Southeast.

This series of river development projects presents an excellent example of partnership between the Federal Government and private enterprise. The Alabama Power Co. has worked closely with the Federal Government in planning and constructing dams for power generation.

There also is a need for flood control. The State of Alabama is interested in greater recreational development along the two rivers in conjunction with reservoirs.

The outlook is one of optimism generated by the lively imagination, hard work, and foresight of many citizens, and the cooperation of government at the local, State, and Federal levels.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This amendment would exclude, in addition to the Dubuque project previously mentioned, money for a project at Waterloo, Iowa, and also one near Ames, Iowa. I strongly supported the Waterloo project because it has been badly needed for years. Industries in Waterloo have been hit by flood after flood in recent years. As Lt. Governor Fulton testified before the committee, this situation has increased the risk of losing existing industries there in addition to discouraging new industries from coming there.

The project at Ames was authorized last year. The Budget Bureau recommended the money to relocate a new interstate highway there but did not recommend any money for planning preparatory to construction. The Budget Bureau has a judgment to make as to which projects should be pushed faster, but the House makes its own final decision before acting and I hope my colleagues will agree that the planning on this Skunk River project should be started now.

I urge the rejection of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 4, line 14, strike out "\$953,715,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$923,715,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is the first category included in the previous amendment which was just rejected. This would delete unbudgeted new planning and construction starts, resumptions and increases in the budgeted amount. Thirty million dollars are involved in this amendment.

It is not fair to say, as has been said here in connection with the previous amendment, that there would not be

funds for planning, that a new construction program would not go forward if this amendment were to be adopted. I think it more fair to say that a more restrictive and probably more cohesive program will go forward by the adoption of this amendment than will be the case if it is not adopted.

We already have, Mr. Chairman, a \$6½ billion program ready to proceed with, a backlog of that amount of authorized projects requiring additional planning and construction money, without adding these unbudgeted items that are included in the bill and which, in my opinion as I have said before, ought to be removed from the bill at this time.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I must admit that at this time I am confused by the gentleman's amendment as I am sure many of my colleagues are. The gentleman in his wisdom for some reason has singled out in his minority report a project in my district. I am wondering if that is in this particular amendment or is that a special amendment?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is not included in this particular amendment. This would apply only to unbudgeted projects.

Mr. RESNICK. I am just waiting for the lightning to strike and I just want to know when to look. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to strike the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project appropriation from the bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] has stated the reasons he wants this and the other 14 projects in one category stricken is because either they have a low benefit-to-cost ratio, or there is no urgency in proceeding with them, or because there is considerable controversy over their merits. In answer to these objections let me say this:

Certainly the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project does not come within the purview of the gentleman's first objection that the benefit-to-cost ratio is low. The benefit-to-cost ratio of this project is 1.86 to 1 which is better than 55 percent of the projects to which a cost ratio can be assigned and which were authorized by Congress last year, and it is better by far than benefit-to-cost ratios of many other hydroelectric projects which have been authorized by this Congress in the past; to wit, the Colorado River storage project had a ratio of 1.3 to 1, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project had a 1.65 to 1.

With respect to the gentleman's contention that there is no urgency in going ahead with this project, I would like to point out that the demand for electricity throughout the United States is increasing rapidly and this is especially true in the New England area. The blackout last year in New England and New York, which fortunately was not too harmful could have been catastrophic, was in no small measure due to the fact that the demand for electricity in

New England and New York exceeded the supply. It is true we have to appropriate money for our effort in Vietnam, but the industry that supports the effort in Vietnam must also go on and this industry requires an abundance of low-cost electricity.

Finally, in answer to the gentleman's statement that the project is controversial let me say first of all that there should be no controversy over it whatsoever on its merit. The project has been thoroughly studied and approved by the Department of the Interior, the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, but if there is any doubt about its merits, the controversy has been compromised in committee by a reduction from the budgeted amount of \$1.2 million to \$800,000 and the committee has recommended a staff study of the project. I see no need for such a study nor do I see the need for cutting the recommended appropriation. I am confident that the study will uphold the previous exhaustive studies that have been made, and I am hoping that the study can be made as soon as possible so that the remaining moneys may be appropriated as they are needed to construct this much needed project as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. For what reason does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] rise?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] is the first part of the package which we have already defeated. This pertains to unbudgeted, new planning, construction starts, resumptions and increases in budgeted amounts and it comes to a total, as indicated by the gentleman, of \$30 million.

This would affect all projects where we have moved them from the planning to the construction stage; all projects which we put in which were unbudgeted; and this will affect all projects which we have increased the sum of the amounts for budgeted items, such as the Chatfield Dam, the Dubuque, Hugo Reservoir, New Hope Reservoir, Ashtabula Harbor, and a great number of projects all over the United States would be affected by this amendment.

We have already defeated this amendment in the big package and I urge the Committee not to go along with amendment.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. As I understand this amendment, its net effect would be to delete very important projects in my congressional district.

Mr. Chairman, it must be exceedingly difficult for the Members to fully grasp the magnitude of flood problems on the north coast of California. We have the major projects on Corta Madera Creek in Marin County, the Warm Springs-Dry Creek Dam in Sonoma County, the

Redwood Creek Flood Control Levee in Humboldt County and many other projects, at varying degrees of progress toward construction, that are involved in this matter. Year after year, the devastating floods hit these areas; the people have been waiting for a long time for relief from this annual flood threat.

If this amendment, and the others offered to delete these items are passed, it would prolong the agony and suffering of the people in this area. I violently object to these amendments and vigorously support the gentleman from Massachusetts in opposing this and similar amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 4, line 14, strike out "\$953,715,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$953,065,000".

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is the second category, which is a selective list of 15 projects which ought to be deferred at this time of fiscal difficulties. The amount of money involved is \$3,735,000. It would include a group of projects of low benefit-to-cost ratio, or of high controversy, or of lack of urgency priority at this time.

I know that it is not easy for Members who are aware of particular problems to criticize and ridicule the attempt to withdraw projects from funding at this time when a low benefit-to-cost ratio is shown. But I think in fairness to this subcommittee, if there have been changes in conditions in these areas affecting these projects, I think that we have a right to expect that those charged with the administration of those projects and requesting funding of them to come up and tell us about it, and I think it is unfair criticism now to point out, "Oh, we have had a lot of floods since then, and a lot of people have died since then, and now you want to condemn other people to death. You want to condemn other people to flooding."

There is not a single man on this subcommittee who feels that way, and least of all the gentleman who is now addressing the Committee of the Whole. But I think we have a right, if these problems are critical, to have someone come and tell us about them, and not require us to rely upon newspaper stories, headlines, and garish pictures that appear in magazines and newspapers throughout this country. So I do not accept with a very good grace the criticism that some of these projects are a lot more urgent than we on the committee have been told. I think that if there has been a change in circumstances, we ought to have new studies and investigations. We ought to have up-to-date

information brought before us, because some of these projects do show a very unfavorable benefit-to-cost ratio. One of them on this list has a benefit-to-cost ratio of 0.47 to 1. I do not think we should be funding projects of that kind. If these are inaccurate figures, it is not our fault. It is the fault of those who are charged with proposing these projects, and justifying them before our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that each of these 15 projects was not justified on the record, and on the record we must rely if we are to fulfill our responsibility to the other Members of this House, and to the country as a whole. On the record these projects should be deleted, and I ask that they be deleted.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This is the second category in the amendments that the gentleman from Wisconsin has offered. This amendment would affect five projects which total \$650,000. These are new budgeted starts which the committee in its wisdom and in its judgment decided ought to go in.

All of them have a favorable cost-benefit ratio.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The England Pond levee project in the State of Illinois has a benefit-to-cost ratio of 0.47 to 1.

Mr. BOLAND. I understood that the gentleman's amendment was directed to the \$650,000 reduction which he wanted to eliminate. I find only five projects there. Those projects have a benefit-to-cost ratio of 4.2 to 1, 6.2 to 1, and 1.2 to 1.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thought the amendment which the Clerk read is directed to the \$3,735,000 item, which includes a list of 15 budgeted projects which I have read to the Committee.

I do have a pending amendment which would apply to the \$650,000 to which the gentleman has reference. It has not yet been read by the Clerk.

Mr. BOLAND. Fine. I am addressing myself to projects which are 15. They are budgeted: California, Eel River; California, Lytel and Warm Creeks; Florida, Ponce de Leon Inlet; Illinois, Richland Creek; Kentucky, Paintsville Reservoir; New Jersey, Atlantic City; Oklahoma, Lukfata Reservoir; Virginia, Virginia Beach; West Virginia, Burnsville Reservoir; West Virginia, R. D. Bailey Reservoir; Maine, Dickey-Lincoln School project; Kentucky, Martin's Fork Reservoir; Texas, Trinity River; Colorado, Trinidad Reservoir; and Illinois, England Pond levee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I just went up to the Clerk's desk to take a look at the amendment, and the amendment is for less than a \$700,000 cut. It does not provide the \$3 million cut the

gentleman from Wisconsin is talking about. I think it is equally bad, but it is not the amendment the gentleman thinks he is talking about.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman: May we be advised which of the two amendments is now pending, which one the Clerk did read? I understood it to be the cut of \$3,735,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 4, line 14, strike out "\$953,715,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$953,065,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected. I understood the Clerk to read the amendment relating to the list of projects. This appears to be the one we have been discussing. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk may read the amendment relating to the \$3,735,000 reduction, and that this be considered as before the Committee at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there is one amendment pending. Does the gentleman intend to offer another amendment?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes, there is one further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will instruct the gentleman that we will dispose of this amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which was read by the Clerk be withdrawn and that the Clerk now read the amendment relating to the reduction of \$3,735,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment referred to will be withdrawn and the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 4, line 14, strike out "\$953,715,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$949,980,000".

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I regret the error that I made. I did not properly hear the Clerk.

However, the amendment to which my remarks were addressed related to the list of 15 projects representing a reduction of \$3,735,000, which I consider to be subject to deferment for various reasons at this time. I believe I have discussed those, thinking that that was the amendment before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 4, line 14, strike out "\$953,715,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$953,065,000".

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I now ask that we consider this amendment which I thought the Clerk apparently had read, the one that I withdrew, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be brief. This represents a list of five projects, the justification for which is more than 50 percent recreation. It includes funds for: Virginia Key and Key Biscayne, Fla., construction funds; Haleiwa Beach, Oahu, which is a reimbursement project, for which I believe is fairness reimbursement could be delayed until the next fiscal year; Honokahau Harbor, Hawaii, which includes \$33,000 for planning; and for Ocracoke Island, N.C., \$15,000 in planning; and for the Smithville Reservoir, in Missouri, \$50,000 for planning.

This is not much money, \$650,000, in today's money market, but this will be a gesture indicating that we cannot approve primarily recreation projects at this time in our country's critical fiscal situation.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have already discussed the effect of this amendment. It will, as the gentleman says, affect five projects which he has delineated. All of them are recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. All of them have favorable benefit-to-cost ratios.

I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLARK: On page 4, line 14, strike out "\$953,715,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$953,215,000".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, this bill should be amended to delete an appropriation of \$500,000 on behalf of the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal. Such appropriation would be ill considered and certainly is premature at this time. In fact, the project for which this money is to be appropriated, has not even been considered, let alone approved by the Committee on Public Works. Before the project is authorized, and certainly before any appropriation is made for it, it should be determined whether the Governors of the two States involved, namely, Ohio and Pennsylvania, are in favor of the project and whether the needed local support will be forthcoming. No such determination has been made. The Governor of Pennsylvania is on record as opposing this project as worthless and harmful to Pennsylvania, and it has similarly been opposed by both Pennsylvania Senators and by virtually all Members of this House from Pennsylvania. There is serious question whether it will not be opposed also by the Governor of Ohio. It is likely that this is so because the enormous expense to which this project will put the State of Ohio and its political subdivisions will greatly outweigh any benefit which the canal could bring.

I represent the only congressional district in Pennsylvania through which the proposed canal would run. I have studied this project with care, and I am convinced that there will be no benefit to my district whatever. On the contrary, it will be costly and harmful.

It will cost the local government in my district well over \$15 million to relocate and reconstruct water intakes and outlets, sewer lines, public utility lines, and so forth. We will be called upon to provide at local expense large disposal areas. I estimate that the annual cost of maintenance will be well over \$300,000 per year for the 50-year life of the project. I doubt that the local interests in my district could provide any such sums and I am certain that even if they could, they would resist such payments, because no benefit could be derived from the project.

On the contrary, if the canal is built and is even half as successful as its advocates claim, it will cause unemployment among the railroad employees in my district whose jobs will be eliminated by the canal. More than that, it will intensify the pollution problem from which we now suffer. Already the Mahoning River is an open sewer whose pollution is dumped into the Beaver River.

The local authorities in Ohio have stated at various public hearings, that they cannot afford to improve the quality of the water of the Mahoning. On the other hand, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has found and has reported that if the canal were to be built, pollution of the Mahoning River would be greatly intensified. For this reason alone we would oppose the project.

All these problems and many more should be given consideration before a project of this sort is authorized, and certainly before we start spending money in its behalf, especially at a time when inflation is one of our great problems.

When this project was first proposed by House Document 277 in 1934, the mileage or length of the canal was to be 35 miles, now it is 120 miles.

The first cost to local interest was \$10 million, now it is \$95 million, which does not include any money for construction of terminal facilities at Lake Erie or any place on the canal route.

The annual local cost in 1934 was \$600,000 for 50 years. Now this cost per year for 50 years has risen to \$10,300,000, and that is a lot of money.

Threatening telegrams certainly do not help any cause:

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO,
September 21, 1966.

Congressman FRANK CLARK,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.:

9,000 Western Pennsylvanians who are your constituents depend on their jobs in the Mahoning Valley. Your support of the appropriations bill approving the inter-connecting waterway would be in their best interests and would have their approval. Your opposition to the project would result in the opposition to your candidacy for reelection.

JAMES P. GRIFFIN,
Director, District 26, 400 Realty Building,
Youngstown, Ohio.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], in opposing this project.

My remarks concern the merits of the project: the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal.

First. The cost has gone up from the original proposal of about \$200 million to about \$1 billion. It is clear that the actual cost will greatly exceed this amount.

Second. The benefits are based upon questionable economics in comparing rail and barge rates. These rates, if correctly computed, would show that there would be no real benefit from savings in transportation costs.

Third. A part of the justification is based on recreation. This is a speculative proposition and, at any rate, it would seem that there are enough recreational facilities that could be provided at a lesser cost that would not involve construction of a billion-dollar canal.

Fourth. The amount of local cooperation is extremely high, and it is very doubtful if these amounts could be met.

Fifth. The Governor of at least one of the States affected is opposed to the project, and it is unwise for the Congress to proceed with any public works projects, particularly of this magnitude, which is opposed by one or more of the States involved.

For the above reasons I oppose this project for I believe it is economically unsound.

FUTURE COURSE OF ACTION ON REPORT

The report of the River and Harbor Board has now been submitted to the Chief of Engineers, who will prepare his proposed report which he will submit to the Governors of the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio, and the following Federal agencies: Department of Interior; Department of Agriculture; Department of Commerce; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Federal Power Commission; and the Appalachian Regional Commission. A period of 90 days is usually allowed for comments. When the comments are received the Chief of Engineers prepares his final report and then submits the report, together with the Board's report and all accompanying papers, to the Secretary of the Army for transmittal to the Bureau of the Budget, and, finally, for transmittal to the Congress where it is referred to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House.

The committees would then have for consideration the report of the Board of Engineers, the Chief of Engineers, the States, interested Federal agencies, and the comments of the Secretary of the Army and the Bureau of the Budget. The entire matter would therefore be available for consideration by the two committees and for whatever action is considered appropriate at that time.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this project is without merit and of doubtful authorization. On May 20, 1940, President Roosevelt asked Attorney General Jackson to advise his opinion as to whether or not the project for improvement of the Beaver and

Mahoning Rivers in Pennsylvania and Ohio needed further authorization by Congress. The Attorney General advised the President, under date of May 25, 1940, that in his opinion this project would not be authorized without further approval by the Congress to construct the "stub-end" canal to Youngstown.

At a time when Congress is concerned about inflation is not the time to consider such a large expenditure, running into billions of dollars, which could result only in questionable benefits to one locality. Such extravagance should not be considered even in times of top prosperity when reviewed as to the harmful effects on all of our eastern seaboard ports, as well as the railroad and dock companies, who estimate such diversion of traffic would eliminate some 8,000 jobs in communities as far away from the canal as New York, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, and Detroit. Even greater distress would be felt in the communities immediately adjacent to the canal.

Certainly this is not in the national interest, and I join with my colleagues in support of this amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because I am opposed to appropriating funds for the construction of this canal in spite of my high esteem and friendship for the author of the proposal. This cannot be a help to my district, and it could be very harmful. I realize, though, coming into the well on a bill of this sort is like a physician trying to take out Santa Claus' appendix on Christmas Eve when he has a pack of gifts on his back. I realize that most every Member of this House has a personal interest in this bill. I can say truthfully that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], deserves the great and high esteem in which he is held by the Members of the House of Representatives as well as the others, because of the wonderful work he has done on behalf of public works, water conservation, and flood control projects all over this great country. However, we from western Pennsylvania, feel we have a serious problem with Lake Erie and Ohio River Canal, and are here today for one purpose—to make a record and point out the fact that we do not believe this canal is going to be beneficial to us. Pennsylvania is still the steel center of the world. We do not need this canal to increase our steel production. We do not need it for any other purpose. So my appearance here today is for one reason. I am speaking for the Congressmen from western Pennsylvania in opposition to appropriating any funds for this project.

The proposed canal project will cost both the State of Ohio and the State of Pennsylvania and the various municipalities and the public facilities and railroads an enormous amount of money. Until a full report has come in from the Corps of Engineers with respect to the project becoming available, it is not even possible at this moment to estimate the cost of this canal.

Mr. Chairman, the cost as pointed out in the committee report is \$917 million of Federal money and—non-Federal cost—is going to be \$95 million. This is over \$1 billion. This is a conservative figure—it will be over \$2 billion before one barge ever travels this canal.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that only \$500,000 is being requested today, but this is the foot in the door of a project that will eventually cost \$2 billion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I can truthfully say, that most everyone in Pennsylvania, including the Governor, both Senators from Pennsylvania, every Congressman from western Pennsylvania and central Pennsylvania, the Mayor of Pittsburgh, the Democratic ex-Governor of Pennsylvania, David Lawrence; the ex-Gov. George Leader, are in opposition to this canal.

Mr. Chairman, such great newspapers of Pennsylvania as the Pittsburgh Press and the Post Gazette, have all run editorials in opposition to this canal.

In Ohio such great newspapers as the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Toledo Blade, the Cleveland Press, and the Columbus Citizen-Journal have condemned this project in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Chairman, I have not heard one single word of support for this canal from the two great Senators from the State of Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this canal, if it has any merit, should be studied further so that the people who will really benefit should come forward at a public hearing to testify as to whether this is a feasible project. Personally, I feel, aside from the city of Youngstown, Ohio, the proposed canal has no local support. It is difficult to see why this project should be foisted upon so-called prime beneficiaries who do not favor it.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I do so, however, with considerable regret because of my high regard and respect for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

However, Mr. Chairman, because of the feeling of the people in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent that this project will be harmful to that district, I must rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the report which this distinguished committee brings to us today, on page 5 thereof, is the following wording:

It should be noted that public works projects, before they are eligible for funding, are subject to a most exhaustive review process to assure they are economically justified. After a thorough study by the responsible agency and clearance with all other agencies involved, they are carefully reviewed by the legislative committees of Congress before they are authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, that careful review has not been given in this case.

The only legislation which can possibly be considered to authorize this project is the act of August 30, 1935.

Mr. Chairman, no member of the present Public Works Committee was a member of the authorizing committee in 1935.

At the time this project was authorized we were in the depths of a great depression when unemployment was rampant. At that time, in 1935, the estimated cost of a 35-mile canalization of the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers was \$37 million. Conditions are entirely different today. The proposed canal is 120 miles long. It is estimated to cost \$917 million.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this question of the authorization was raised at another time in 1939. The question of a \$207 million project was brought before the Board of Engineers. At that time President Roosevelt asked for a legal opinion as to whether the authorization for the \$37 million canal would carry for the \$200 million canal. The Attorney General at that time, Mr. Robert Jackson, replied to the President as follows:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to refer to your memorandum of May 20th requesting my advice as to whether the project for the improvement of the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers in Pennsylvania and Ohio, commonly known as the Stub End Canal to Youngstown, may be constructed without further authorization from Congress.

He concluded:

It is my opinion therefore that the War Department would not be authorized without further approval by the Congress to construct the Stub End Canal to Youngstown.

Mr. Chairman, what was true in 1940 is even more so today. I do not believe that the project should be approved until it is given careful and thorough scrutiny by the proper authorizing committee in the light of the conditions as they exist today.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be adopted.

The letter referred to follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C. May 25, 1940.
The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to refer to your memorandum of May 20, requesting my advice as to whether the project for improvement of the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers in Pennsylvania and Ohio, commonly known as the "stub-end" canal to Youngstown, may be constructed without further authorization from the Congress.

The above project was adopted and authorized by the Congress in the act of August 30, 1935, c. 831, 49 Stat. 1028, 1035, in the following language:

"Beaver and Mahoning Rivers, Pennsylvania and Ohio; of the width and depth provided in House Document Numbered 277, Seventy-third Congress, as a Federal project and to continue to Lake Erie at or near Ash-Tabula, Ohio, subject to the final approval of the whole project from the Ohio River to Lake Erie by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors."

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in its report on the above project (House Doc. 277, 73d Cong.) recommended improvement by canalization of the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers, Pennsylvania and Ohio, from the mouth of the Beaver River to Struthers, Ohio, at a total estimated cost of \$37,000,000 with \$640,000 annually for operation and maintenance. It was provided that local interests should pay the cost of necessary changes to railroad bridges, tracks, etc., estimated at approximately \$5,642,000. In this connection the report states (pp. 14-15):

"* * * Where new bridges are required over cut-offs the cost must evidently be borne by the United States, but the Beaver

and Mahoning Rivers are considered navigable waters of the United States to a point above the limits of the proposed improvements, and, therefore, the necessary changes in existing structures can be secured under existing law by appropriate orders from the Secretary of War. In the case of the railroad bridges this procedure will necessarily have to be followed. * * *

Thereafter, on December 20, 1938, the Board of Engineers by report appearing in House Document 178, 76th Congress, recommended step by step construction of the waterway extending from the Ohio River through the Beaver, Mahoning, and Grand River Valleys to Lake Erie, the first step to consist of the improvement of the Beaver-Mahoning Rivers, with certain modifications of the plans proposed in House Document No. 277, 73d Congress. The report states (pp. 17-18):

"* * * Because of the large expenditure required for the project and in order that advantage may be taken of changes in economic conditions and of adjustments in transportation charges, the Board believes that construction should be undertaken in several steps as found advisable by the Chief of Engineers; that somewhat unusual requirements for local cooperation are justified; and that the Federal Government should pay for the reconstruction of existing railroad company bridges spanning the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers. To carry out the work in accordance with these conditions it is necessary to secure additional authority from Congress.

"The Board further recommends that in view of the extraordinary enlargement of the river channels, required to provide a suitable through waterway, the Federal Government pay the cost, as determined by the Chief of Engineers, that is finally involved in making necessary changes in existing railroad company crossings, and track adjustments in connection therewith."

Chairman MANSFIELD of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House in letter of April 15, 1939, to General Schley, concludes that the approval by the Congress in the Rivers and Harbors Act of August 30, 1935, of the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers project constitutes ample authority for the Engineer Corps to proceed with the improvement on the basis of including alterations to railroad bridges as part of the Federal cost.

I find myself unable to agree with this conclusion. Such provisional approval of the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers project as was given by the Congress in the act of August 30, 1935, was conditioned upon local interests bearing the costs of altering railroad bridges. The Board of Engineers subsequently proposed modifications of this plan, including the recommendation that the Federal Government pay the cost of altering the bridges. This is obviously a matter for the Congress to determine. The discretion vested in the Chief of Engineers to make such modifications as may be advisable (House Doc. 277, 73d Cong., p. 4, para. 9) would not, in my opinion, empower him under the circumstances to bind the Federal Government to bear the above-mentioned cost of alterations to railroad bridges.

It is my opinion, therefore, that the War Department would not be authorized without further approval by the Congress to construct the "stub-end" canal to Youngstown.

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. JACKSON,
Attorney General.

The CHAIRMAN. For what reason does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] rise?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the question here is whether Congress shall start the construction of the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio Canal, a giant program that will cost the U.S. taxpayers \$1 billion to \$3 billion. This is not simply a question of any particular geographical district to me, nor of competition between two States. It is a question of whether the canal is really needed. Because the taxpayers will be called upon not only to pay the Federal cost, the State, the county and the local costs but likewise the maintenance costs.

This Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal project has been kicking around for 20 to 25 years. The project has been up and down through the U.S. district engineers, the division engineers and the Board of Engineers in Washington, D.C., with widely varying figures and costs, prospective use and tonnage figures.

As a matter of fact, on the most recent U.S. Corps of Engineers statement, the benefit-cost ratio is only 1.3 to 1. If we look at the current interest rate now being obtained in the U.S. economy, we can see high interest rates the United States will have to pay in financing current public works projects. The interest rate has already gone up to 5½ percent for FHA loans. The Corps of Engineers has figured the benefit-cost ratio on the basis that financing interest payable on this construction would be 3¾ percent. This is completely impractical and impossible at the present time. Placing the interest rate at 5½ percent instead of 3¾ percent for financing brings down the benefit-cost ratio to \$1.0625 benefits to \$1 costs which means we hardly would get the money back. Under these circumstances this canal should not be built.

This canal will compete with existing transportation facilities, so it is not opening up new routes. There is already transportation both by truck and by rail between Lake Erie and the Ohio River that is not adequately being used. We have now the terminals built on Lake Erie and the rivers, and likewise have the plant facilities, which will be made obsolete by this canal.

One other point is that this proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal is not a public works project but is largely for private benefit. I make the statement as a fact, and I would like to have it answered—over 50 percent of the total benefit, the total cost of this Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal will go to benefit three companies. I make that as a serious charge. Three companies will get over 50 percent of the benefit of \$1 to \$3 billion worth of U.S. taxpayers' money. If that is wrong, let somebody on this House floor deny it. It is not wrong; it is true.

I have asked the U.S. district engineers, and the Corps of Engineers to reply to this statement. I have never in 10 years received an answer, and I renew the challenge to reply.

Another point is this. If we construct this proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, we are going back into the 1800's, as canals were feasible then. Now canal

traffic is too slow, too limited in size, and this canal is not big enough in size for ordinary lake or river boats, and barges. In Pennsylvania we have had for many years, the Pennsylvania Canal that is not being used. There is the Erie Canal and also the Potomac River Canal. Why does Congress not do something about them? There is no economic sense to it. Canals are not feasible today in Ohio-Pennsylvania hilly terrain because there is not the room. There are not the terminals and it will cost too much to provide terminals in city and industrial areas.

It is interesting to note that Colonel Lorence, the Pittsburgh District Engineer of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers resigned from the U.S. Engineer Corps before his favorable report on the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal proposal was approved by the Board of Engineers.

On October 31, 1947, he turned up as executive vice president of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, the very people who were then lobbying for the canal project. Colonel Lorence actually registered as a lobbyist. His report was approved by the Board of Engineers on November 30, 1948. Colonel Lorence had already appeared in his civilian capacity to push the favorable report he had made just prior to getting the lobbying job. I wonder whether the colonel had not the job in mind before he made his favorable report, the first favorable report on the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal proposal that was made. Is it not surprising that a U.S. Army district engineer promptly is registered as a lobbyist to push the very project that he had just filed an official report to favor even before his report is approved by higher authority in the U.S. Corps of Engineers? There is probably nothing legally wrong in the colonel's actions, nor the association's, but the colonel's action certainly raises a big question on the impartiality and worth of the colonel's favorable report.

When Ohio and Pennsylvania have already more than adequate transportation facilities, why ruin 8,000 to 11,000 railroad workers' jobs? It has been estimated this number of railroad workers will lose their jobs. This is not a fight on geography. This is a dispute between the various kinds of transportation. I believe that in my area and in Ohio 8,000 to 11,000 railroad workers will lose their jobs if this canal construction goes through. This canal construction at a cost of billions will cause taxes to go up locally; taxes will go up federally, and in our States. Who is going to pay for this useless and unneeded canal? Every taxpayer in Ohio, and Pennsylvania, and the whole United States.

I have represented various railroad brotherhoods at these hearings over the years, showing their opposition to this particular waterway project that will take away substantial rail traffic. Likewise I have represented some of the Ohio citizens, many of them in Grand River Valley in Ohio, at these hearings. The farmers complain about the amount of good land, 60,000 to 80,000 acres, being taken and ruined by this kind of project. We in Congress should look at this ex-

pensive project carefully. We should not look at the project on the basis of sectional interest, but Congress must decide whether it is economical, feasible, and whether it has been investigated properly. It has not, so I strongly oppose the construction of the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, and urge support of the amendment to eliminate the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal project from this bill.

This Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal project has been kicking around for years. A proposal made in the 1920's to build substantially the same canal was defeated in Congress.

Another major effort made by its proponents during the period 1934-39 had to be abandoned because a detailed study of the project by the Interstate Commerce Commission at the request of the White House indicated that the project was without value and would, on the other hand, for the benefit of "a relatively small number of larger shippers" severely damage the railroads, "an agency of transportation whose services are available the year around."

The project was revived immediately after the conclusion of World War II, but the effort collapsed after hearings held before the Board of Engineers—the only public hearings which have ever been held on this project—and the Board was forced to conclude that the project was without merit.

The project was revived again at the beginning of the current decade pursuant to a resolution directing the corps to review all its prior reports and to bring them up to date. This study resulted in the report of the Pittsburgh District Engineer issued in January 1965.

It is significant that substantial opposition immediately developed from the very areas supposed to benefit from the canal. The project was publicly opposed by the Republican Governor of Pennsylvania and by his Democratic predecessor; by the city of Pittsburgh and by numerous other public bodies in western Pennsylvania; by the Allegheny County Labor Council; by the Pittsburgh District of the United Steel Workers; by the Pennsylvania State AFL-CIO; by the railroad labor unions; by the railroads and by their competitors, the Pennsylvania Motor Truck Association, which might be severely hurt if the canal were to be built; and by scores of others.

Nevertheless, the district engineer found the canal to be economically feasible. It is significant, however, that upon review his estimate of benefits was cut to ribbons by the division engineer and that his estimate was further drastically cut by the Board of Engineers. These estimates were as follows: District engineer, 2.2 to 1; division engineer, 1.8 to 1; Board of Engineers, 1.3 to 1.

These sharp cuts, combined with the dismal record of the project over the years, throw great doubt on the merits of the project.

Whereas the district engineer estimated that over 60 million tons of traffic would move over the canal in its first year of operation, this estimate has been cut by the Board to 10 million tons; and

the Board indicated that the full volume of traffic estimated by the district engineer would not be reached for some 50 years. In the face of rapidly developing technology, particularly in the steel industry, in the iron mining industry, and in rail transportation, an investment for so low a benefit is doubtful indeed.

It must be noted also that the margin of benefit ratio at 1.3 to 1 is so narrow as to allow for no margin of error. Any underestimate of cost, overestimate of traffic, or other adverse development would mean that the cost of the canal would actually exceed any benefit to be derived from it. Moreover, this important point must be raised: The estimated benefit-to-cost ratio rests in large measure on the assumption that the entire vast sum required to build this canal can be borrowed by the Federal, State, and local governments involved at an interest rate of $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent. Under present conditions, this is an absurd assumption. We all know what rates of interest even the Federal Government must pay for borrowed money today, and the homebuilder must now pay $5\frac{1}{2}$ percent on FHA loans. Use of a realistic interest rate would in itself make the canal uneconomic.

In the face of these uncertainties the Congress should take a closer look at this project before appropriating any money in its behalf.

IT IS LATE IN THE DAY TO BUILD A BARGE CANAL

In the face of the technology of the mid-20th century, construction of this canal would be absurd. The value of the proposed canal should be clearly distinguished from the value of our great waterways, such as the Ohio and Mississippi rivers. On these large reaches large tows can operate and barges and tows can moor and unload in the channel. These conditions are a far cry from those of the proposed canal. By reason of the topography its channel will be winding and narrow. Through Youngstown the width will be limited to 200 feet; but because of local conditions no greater width is possible. This means that tows will barely be able to pass in opposite directions. It will greatly limit speed and maneuverability on the canal particularly in times of bad weather. More importantly, it will completely preclude the possibility of unloading barges in the channel. Thus they cannot be moored and unloaded at the plants of the steel mills. It will be necessary to build turnouts and mooring basins and to provide expensive and elaborate handling equipment. Due to the topography these unloading points can only be at some distance from the steel mills. Accordingly transshipment of cargoes from these unloading points into rail cars or trucks, and overland transportation to the mills, will be required. This will impose great expense in operation, which the Board seems not to have considered.

IT IS DOUBTFUL THAT IRON ORE TRAFFIC WILL MATERIALIZE FOR THE CANAL

Nearly one-half of the tonnage which the proponents claim for the canal consists of iron ore and limestone. There is a real question whether any iron ore or limestone would be shipped by this

canal. Not a single steel plant along the whole length of the proposed canal has given any indication whatever that it would expect to take any iron ore or limestone from the canal. Since the steel industry in Pittsburgh and Youngstown is supposed to be the chief beneficiary of this project, it would seem extraordinary that not one of the companies has expressed any interest in the project. But consideration of the facts will indicate why this is so.

All of the river plants have been planned, built, and operated on the basis of taking delivery of this tonnage from rail. Even assuming that the plants could be rearranged to take delivery from barges, this would involve an enormously expensive effort in the case of every one of the plants. In fact, in almost all cases the river sites are so narrow and congested that there may be no scope for such rearrangement. It is significant in this connection that a representative of the six steel plants in the Youngstown district testified at a hearing held on July 26, 1966, before the Ohio Water Pollution Control Board that these plants did not even have space on their site to permit the construction of cooling towers.

At present, ore and limestone destined for the Youngstown and Pittsburgh mills is unloaded from vessels at Lake Erie ports. It is then placed in rail cars and delivered directly to the plant, where it is unloaded directly into separate bins or stock piles within the plant. If the canal were to be built, the same tonnage would, at the Lake Erie port, be first loaded into barges and these would then have to be unloaded near the point of consumption into rail cars or trucks for delivery to the plant. This extra handling would undoubtedly be sufficiently costly to overcome any economy that might be achieved from barge transportation.

In the face of the foregoing, it is difficult to see how the prospect of a limited reduction in the transportation cost of ore and limestone could present an inducement to the investment of great sums for plant conversion.

THE CLAIM THAT THE STEEL COMPANIES IN THE PITTSBURGH AND YOUNGSTOWN AREAS NEED THE CANAL TO SURVIVE IS NONSENSE

The chief claim made for the canal by its proponents is that unless the canal is built the steel industries in Pittsburgh and in Youngstown will wither away. Such a claim is nonsense in the face of the announcement made on Friday, September 16, 1966, by United States Steel Corp. that it will build a new cold rolling mill in the Pittsburgh district which will almost double its Irwin works capacity to produce steel for the big-volume auto, appliance, furniture, and related industries. This project is described by United States Steel President Leslie B. Worthington as "one of the largest facility expansion programs in the recent economic history of western Pennsylvania." Mr. Worthington further stated:

This new plant expansion represents a whopping investment in our faith in this country's economy and in what we believe to be Western Pennsylvania's role in the nation's economic picture.

Mr. Worthington added:

We intend to keep the Mon Valley competitive in a way that will help it to retain its position as a keystone in the nation's economic structure. United States Steel is not walking away from its investment here.

This is a far cry from the dire predictions of the proponents of the canal.

THE CLAIMED COAL TRAFFIC WILL NOT MATERIALIZE

There is no substantial prospect that the coal tonnage claimed for the canal will materialize.

There is, of course, an almost unlimited tonnage of coal in the ground in the great Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kentucky coal mining areas. However, only a limited part of this coal lies sufficiently close to navigable water to be economically transported by barge. Such coal is known as river coal. Since river coal was the first to be exploited, it has now been largely consumed; unimpeachable industry statistics indicate that all river coal in the area will be wholly exhausted by about the year 2000. In the meantime, nearly all of this river coal is either captive to steel mills in the Pittsburgh area or is committed by contract to great electric powerplants already built or under construction or in the planning stage along the Ohio River and its tributaries. None of this coal will move to the canal under any circumstances. This means that at best only a trickle of the coal which the engineers claim as potential tonnage for the canal will in fact be carried by it.

THE CANAL WOULD GREATLY INTENSIFY POLLUTION IN THE MAHONING RIVER

The extreme pollution of the Mahoning River is as notorious as is the desperate water shortage in the whole area. The plans for the proposed canal were reviewed by the U.S. Public Health Service, and in their report filed with the district engineer it was shown that canalization of the Mahoning River would greatly intensify pollution in the Mahoning River, because construction of the locks would create slack pools which would slow the normal flow of water. The report also pointed out that use of already scarce water for operation of the canal would withdraw from use for industrial and domestic purposes what little additional water might possibly be made available. The district engineer simply overrode these objections.

It is very probable that in the years to come availability of reasonably pure water will be vastly more important to industrial and domestic development in the Mahoning and Beaver Valleys than would the construction of this canal.

THIS IS AN INAPPROPRIATE TIME TO SPEND PUBLIC MONEY IN BEHALF OF A CIVILIAN PROJECT OF DOUBTFUL VALUE

A time when the greatest domestic threat is that of inflation is certainly not the moment to embark upon a program of vast Government expenditure in behalf of a civilian project whose merit has not been demonstrated.

ADVERSE EFFECT OF THE CANAL ON THE PORTS AND RAILROADS OF THE AREA

If the canal should be built and if the traffic claimed for it should develop, all of it must be diverted from the railroads

and from the Lake Erie ports which are now handling it. The adverse effect upon the railroads and the existing ports and upon their employees would be serious.

The railroads and dock companies have estimated that such diversion would eliminate some 8,000 jobs in communities as far away from the canal as New York, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Roanoke, and Detroit. The effect on some of the railroads in the canal area might well be disastrous. It is hard to believe that it is in the national interest to bring about such a result.

EFFECT ON LOCAL COMMUNITIES

The cost of the proposed project to the States of Ohio and Pennsylvania and to the municipalities, public utilities, and railroads in the area of the canal will be enormous. Until the full report of the Board of Engineers with respect to the project becomes available, it is not possible to estimate this precisely; but it is indicated from the Board's public announcement that the aggregate of local costs will be increased rather than decreased from those in the division engineer's report. These estimates are as follows:

	Division engineer	Board
Local first costs.....	\$85,300,000	\$95,000,000
Local annual charges (each year for 50 years).....	4,500,000	10,300,000

These figures are large enough. But they do not include the large cost of building and maintaining the canal terminals. These costs will increase the total costs which will have to be borne by the local interests in Ohio to more than a quarter of a billion dollars.

Local municipalities in both Ohio and Pennsylvania will have to spend millions to relocate water intakes and outflows and sewer, water supply, and drainage facilities. Similar sums will have to be spent by public utilities, railroads, and steel mills for the relocation of bridges and the like. Very large operating expenses will also fall upon the local communities for years to come. How will they provide these funds?

It is therefore little wonder that, aside from the city of Youngstown, the proposed canal has no local support. The canal has been openly opposed by the Governor of Pennsylvania; the mayor of Pittsburgh; the county commissioners of Beaver County, Pa., through which the canal will run; official local planning boards, and others. Both Pennsylvania Senators and virtually all Representatives in Congress from Pennsylvania are opposed. No support for the project has yet been heard from either of the two Senators from Ohio. The city of Cleveland, the largest city in Ohio and a supposed beneficiary of the canal, and numerous other Ohio interests have opposed the project.

Such great newspapers in the State of Ohio as the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Toledo Blade, the Cleveland Press, and the Columbus Citizen-Journal have editorially condemned the project in no un-

certain terms. Editorial opposition by the press in Pennsylvania is unanimous.

Since those who are to be major beneficiaries of the projects do not favor it, it is difficult to see why this project should be forced upon them at enormous expense to the whole Nation.

HISTORY OF 1947-48 REPORTS OF U.S. CORPS OF ENGINEERS ON PROPOSAL FOR LAKE ERIE-OHIO RIVER CANAL

Colonel Walter E. Lorence, District Engineer of the Corps of Engineers, Pittsburgh, submitted his Review of Reports on the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal to the Division Engineer on August 12, 1947.

On October 31, 1947, Colonel Lorence resigned from the Corps and promptly became employed as Executive Vice President of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, the lobbying organization which had long advocated construction of the Canal.

On May 14, 1948, the Division Engineer submitted Colonel Lorence's Review Report to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

On November 17, 1948, the Board held a public hearing on the project in Pittsburgh. At that hearing Colonel Lorence (now Mr. Lorence) appeared in his new civilian capacity. Mr. Lorence did not identify himself as the District Engineer who had prepared the report, but stated only that he appeared as the authorized representative of these organizations. On the contrary, in commenting on the Review Report, Mr. Lorence referred to the reporting District Engineer in the third person. Thus, he stated "the District Engineer's Review Report covers the cold figures that alone justify the investment in the Canal."

On November 30, 1948, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors established a special review board to review the project. On the basis of the findings of this board, the Review Report was returned by the board to the Pittsburgh District Engineer for further study. It remained gathering dust until 1961 when the study was exhumed at the insistence of Representative KIRWAN.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of my colleague from Pennsylvania. I regret very much that I have to take this stand. I think this is a good bill except for one item. I regret very much that I have to disagree with the gentleman from Ohio, the committee chairman. He has done a tremendous job, and I hold him in high regard. However, after studying the economic aspect of this canal, I fail to see any justification for it. The canal might have been good 150 years ago. In fact, after the engineers originally studied this route, the railroads came in and they dropped the idea. Today, of course, with rapid transportation—the railroads and the highways—there is no justification to go back to a slow, 18th century waterway. The railroads are doing a tremendous job in this country. We have, relatively, the cheapest transportation in the world. To give you an example of the efficiency of the railroads, after World War I there were 2.5 million employees. Today there are slightly over 820,000 employees hauling much more freight and at a very low cost per ton-mile.

The Railway Labor Executives Association, representing 22 unions, are in opposition to the big ditch, along with

the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.

Another economic aspect of this, as I see it, is that it will benefit only one industry in one city, basically the steel industry in Youngstown, Ohio. By an engineering report, even by the year 2000 this waterway or this canal, if ever built—and I hope it is not built—will be hauling 115 million tons of raw material, and 95 percent of this will be the raw material for the steel industry.

Another economic factor is the interest rate. No one has taken into consideration the 5-percent or 6-percent interest factor. On a billion or two billion cost, we will have anywhere from \$50 to \$100 million in interest involved. I am sure this is much higher than the savings, or the supposed savings that will be made by hauling the raw material of the steel industry on this canal.

Further, it will flood 80,000 acres, the best acres in eastern Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the amendment. I am against this Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HARSHA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Many have said what benefits are we going to realize from this—What are we going to receive from it? I do not know what provincial interests any one will receive but I do know that it does not take a man of rare vision to see the obvious benefits to the entire Nation of connecting the Ohio River with the St. Lawrence Seaway, thereby joining the vast industrial complexes of the two greatest inland navigation systems in the world by a modern artery for low-cost water transportation.

Such a connection will mean expanded markets for the industries in both regions. Coal costs for industries and electric powerplants on the lakes will be reduced. Iron ore will move more cheaply to Ohio Valley mills. Opportunities to reach world markets via the St. Lawrence will be opened to industries all along the Ohio River Valley.

For the coal industry of southeastern Ohio, West Virginia, and Kentucky this can be an inestimable boon.

In very real terms, the new waterway will fuse the entire Ohio Valley into the St. Lawrence Seaway economy.

Many of today's opponents to this investment in the progress and growth of this great Nation are the same persons who only yesterday voted approval for an expenditure of over \$3 billion in foreign aid. I presume they justify this vote on the grounds that foreign aid will enhance the economic development of some of these so-called underdeveloped nations and that consequently the world, including the United States, will be better off as a result. Yet these same proponents of this line of reasoning are objecting to an investment in the future of this Nation—an investment that will reap great rewards for the country as a whole—an investment that will help the transportation industries

of this Nation cope with the ever-increasing demand for expansion and service, an investment that will create countless new job opportunities, an investment that will result in expanded markets for new and existing industries, an investment that will help keep American industry competitive with foreign imports, an investment that will return to the U.S. Treasury untold billions of dollars in tax payments—making available money for future improvements in our country—in other words, my colleagues, an investment in the future and economic well-being of this great Nation.

Contrast this, my friends, with the sorry returns from the investment of untold billions of dollars in foreign aid and ask yourselves—can you in good faith and in good conscience commit yourself to invest the taxpayer's money in questionable programs with questionable returns in foreign nations yet refuse to make this investment in the welfare of your own Nation?

For those of you who are concerned, as I am, with inflation, it is not intended that the project will be constructed during the current period of inflation. Rather, it will take 4 years to plan at a small annual cost. This bill only provides for one-half million dollars—an infinitesimal amount compared to the national budget and the billions we are spending. Construction which would be spread over at least an 8- to 10-year period would not be undertaken until larger public works expenditures are warranted in the economy. As a matter of fact, the availability of low-cost water transportation would benefit the entire Nation by increasing the availability of commodities at a lower cost—a significant counterinflationary influence.

Many of you are concerned, as I am, with the plight of the railroads and their fears as to what this construction may hold in store for them. But let me allay those fears right now—the railroads will fare well and prosper and grow with the development of this waterway system. It is interesting to note that in the Ohio River Valley, since 1950, industry, seeking the advantages of low-cost water transportation and ample water supply, has invested more than \$22 billion in major plant installations and expansions, just in the counties bordering the Ohio and its navigable tributaries. These investments have been largely in the basic industries, which are central to economic growth. As this expansion and growth took place, greater markets and demand for rail transportation occurred. Increased revenues to the railroads resulted and those railroads which were in competition with the Ohio and Mississippi water-transportation systems improved their economic situation far above those which were not in direct competition. Yet these same fears were raised when the canalization of the Ohio River began many years ago. They proved unfounded then as they are now. It is noteworthy, also, that from the end of World War II to 1963 the eight railroads competitive with the Ohio and Mississippi River systems realized a 60-percent expansion in freight revenue as com-

pared with only 37 percent for all other American railroads. Think of that—almost twice as much as those railroads not directly competitive with this waterway transportation system. I say to you, my colleagues, that the railroads will, indeed, be one of the beneficiaries of this investment.

The canal will make its maximum contribution to an American economy of vastly greater dimensions than that which we know today. The waterway cannot, foreseeably, be brought into service in less than 10 years. According to the Bureau of Census estimates, by 1976 the population of the United States will reach 232 million persons; by the year 2000, the waterway will be serving a nation of 350 million, as compared with our present population of less than 200 million. In terms of traffic burden to be borne by all modes of transport, it is reliably estimated that with gross national product expected to triple by the year 2000—just 34 years from now—our transportation system will then be required to carry over three times its present volume.

Against this background, I am convinced that the railroads need have no fear for their future. For them the problem for the future is their adequacy for the demands which the future will make upon them. It is of interest in this connection that in requesting an exemption for railroad equipment from the proposed suspension of the 7-percent investment credit, Mr. Dan Loomis, president of the Association of American Railroads, suggested that the tax incentive program be expanded to encourage "the continuing construction of freight cars, locomotives, piggyback equipment, yards, signaling systems, and other rail facilities required to meet the rising transportation demands of expanding economy and Vietnam military support."

The biggest load the railroads have ever carried so far was about 745 billion ton-miles under the forced draft operation of World War II. But, by 1976, the Nation will demand of the railroads over 1 trillion ton-miles of freight service per year. And, by 2000, if they continue carrying only their present share, the railroads will have to be equipped to carry close to 2 trillion ton-miles of freight, much more than all modes of transportation combined in 1965.

Thus, it is vital that steps be taken toward a balanced expansion of the country's transportation system. The railroads will not be able to carry the entire traffic increment. In view of the huge economic growth lying ahead, they will be under severe strain to handle even their present percentage of the rising total. Each mode of transportation will have to be enlarged and extended so as to provide the type of freight service for which it is best adapted.

Let me say a word to you about the benefit-cost ratio of this project. The Corps of Engineers estimates that ratio at 1.3 to 1—in other words for every \$1 spent the benefits will amount to \$1.30. The corps historically has been conservative on these estimates. For example, in 1908, the corps based its recommendations on the Ohio River navigation project upon traffic of only 9 million tons.

The waterway was not completed until 1929, but by 1950 the tonnage was close to 49 million. The latest estimate shows the waterway carried about 102 million tons in 1965—better than 11 times the corps' original estimate. Again, a corresponding situation occurred on the upper Mississippi River improvement, where by 1965 the tonnage exceeded the corps' estimate by four times. While this benefit-cost ratio is very favorable, the odds, based on experience, are that it is far more favorable than the corps' estimates and America will reap untold rewards from this justifiable investment in the future of this Nation.

Some would deny this boon to America on the plea that it will benefit some areas more than others—but, this is an argument applicable to any particular internal improvement. Any suggestion of discrimination is removed when the improvement program is carried out as is ours on a national basis under standards of uniform application. In this regard, I am reminded of the remarks of Abraham Lincoln, when as a young Congressman from Illinois, he rose as the spokesman of his party in an effort to override a Presidential veto of a river and harbor bill. Commenting on the recently completed Illinois and Michigan Canal connecting the Lakes and the Mississippi for the first time, he said:

Nothing is so local as not to be of some general benefit. Take, for instance, the Illinois and Michigan Canal. Considered apart from its effects, it is perfectly local. Every inch of it is within the State of Illinois. That canal was first opened for business last April. In a very few days we were all gratified to learn, among other things, that sugar had been carried from New Orleans, through the canal, to Buffalo, in New York. This sugar took this route, doubtless, because it was cheaper than the old route. Supposing the benefit in the reduction of the cost of carriage to be shared between seller and buyer, the result is, that the New Orleans merchant sold his sugar a little dearer, and the people of Buffalo sweetened their coffee a little cheaper than before; a benefit resulting from the canal, not to Illinois where the canal is, but to Louisiana and New York, where it is not. In other transactions Illinois will, of course, have her share, and perhaps the larger share too, in the benefits of the canal; but the instance of the sugar clearly shows, that the benefits of an improvement are by no means confined to the particular locality of the improvement itself.

And such is the case in this instance. All America will benefit either directly or indirectly.

Finally, I would be remiss if I failed to express my profound appreciation to the distinguished and beloved chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee to whose boldness, imagination and foresight we are indebted above all others for bringing this great project forward. He is a worthy successor to those men of vision who saw in the linkage of the Great Lakes and the Ohio a source of strength and prosperity for our country. Indeed, I know of no man in modern times who has done more than MIKE KIRWAN in the development of water resources throughout the entire Nation. Without his powerful support the modernization of the Ohio River and the comprehensive development of the

Scioto Basin, which means so much to the people of my district, might well have remained an empty dream. He is forever enrolled among the great builders of America and I consider it a high privilege here to acknowledge my gratitude and my esteem for this great American.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment to strike the funds to initiate planning for the Lake Erie-Ohio River waterway and to make this investment in the future of America.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have listened, Mr. Chairman, with great interest to the remarks of these fine men today from Pennsylvania in opposition to this project. It is interesting that in 1868, Governor John Geary of the State of Pennsylvania recommended construction of the canal and the Legislature of Pennsylvania passed a joint resolution instructing its Senators and Representatives in Congress to urge such action in Congress.

In 1935 this House first passed legislation authorizing this project. Now, who do you think put an amendment in for it on the Senate side to extend it all the way up to the Ohio River? Why, it was the greatest politician in Pennsylvania, Senator Guffey. Now, let me tell you something else. It is interesting that of those who have opposed the project here today I do not think one of them is a union man. I have been paying union dues for 55 years. The railroads have opposed the construction of every waterway we have built, and we have 19,000 miles of them now, and not one has failed to help the railroads. It means business for them and jobs for the men. Yet you have them coming down here testifying on this just like a great big parade.

I will bet you that not one of the men who testified here today is an engineer, and yet they seem to know more than the engineers know about this. We have learned down through their 142 years of existence that the Corps of Engineers are competent, objective, dedicated people without equal in their profession. And they have recommended this project for construction.

Now let me assure you this project is not for Youngstown. That is only a town of 165,000. This is for New York City and Buffalo and Cincinnati and Mobile and the entire Nation. We know from experience that these projects benefit all of America. Where would we be today if we had taken a parochial view of every project we have considered down through the years?

It is claimed that 20,000 railroad employees will lose their jobs. I doubt there are anywhere near that number employed between Pittsburgh and Lake Erie on the railroads. As I said before, every waterway has meant increased business to the railroads. I understand they now support the Arkansas River development, and how they fought to stop that project.

The railroads claim they would haul iron ore for 40 cents a ton if the canal were built. But they are now charging \$2.08 a ton and protesting before the Interstate Commerce Commission an intrastate rate of \$1.88 a ton.

At these rates this great steel-producing area will continue to decline, for it cannot compete favorably with foreign areas or areas enjoying cheap water transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is going to be the greatest canal in the history of mankind. Senator Kerr and his Senate committee went all over the country to study water resource projects and Senator Kerr came back and said that this project was of the highest priority in the development of our waterway system. Our national transportation facilities of all kinds are already overburdened and we must build projects like this if we are to meet the growing requirements of our expanding population.

So I ask you to support the funds included in the bill to begin planning of this project and defeat the amendment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is rather difficult to follow my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. The gentleman has so vividly outlined the facts in this case. But, I want to support him.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and I have studied the proposal of this canal for the State of Ohio for a period of many years. It is my opinion that if there is any man in this Congress who is knowledgeable about the needs of the United States of America and who has contributed so much to our country through his work on the Interior Subcommittee and on the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations—to build America and to do those things which are necessary to build this great land of ours—it is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Further, Mr. Chairman, I believe with all due respect to the "foot soldiers" from Pennsylvania, I say that if there is a "grand commander" upon the question of what is good for this country, it is my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

I have had occasion, therefore, to make a considerable study of its feasibility. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the members of the Committee that this area which will link the Great Lakes and make a complete circle, is not only beneficial to Youngstown, but I must admit that it would also be quite beneficial to areas which I hope to have the honor to represent here in the Congress of the United States later on. And, it will help to develop and bring in new industry and new tax dollars into the Federal Treasury. It is not just a selfish one-city canal. It is for the entire country, as well as for the development of the "Ruhr" of America, which is this area of the State of Ohio.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] made some reference about the Governor of Ohio—and I am sure the gentleman has had no communication from the Governor of Ohio; I am sure the gentleman has nothing to the effect that the Governor of Ohio is opposed to this program.

But, I am in my extension of remarks going to place into the RECORD the fact

that this is authorized, and that there is no question about it.

I might say that as late as the 7th day of September of this year, there was a new finding by the Corps of Engineers. I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], who said there had not been any recent evaluation thereof that this is what the board had to say:

The board concludes that the whole project from the Ohio River to Lake Erie is economically justified and accordingly recommends it for construction substantially in accordance with the plan of the District Engineer, with channel depths of 12 feet, except in the restricted reaches through Youngstown and Warren, Ohio, where a depth of 15 feet would be provided, and with such further modifications as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable. * * *

So on September 7 of this year, just a few days ago, there was another approval by the Corps of Engineers showing the justification of this canal and I would hope that the House will overwhelmingly support the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and defeat this amendment.

This is not the only occasion where things are being done like this. Let me point out to you that this House, with very little opposition, has been going along with building an aircraft—one aircraft with the taxpayers' dollars, a supersonic transport, and it is going to cost the taxpayers of this country \$4 billion over just a few years. This is over a short period of time.

To my friends on the railroads, we have appropriated out of my subcommittee money for the development of new railroad equipment and to develop better railroad equipment. So when we get this better railroad equipment, we will then have more jobs for these people you are talking about. I agree with my friend that there is not going to be the loss of the jobs that has been talked about today.

Mr. Chairman I include at this point in the RECORD the following breakdown on the Lake Erie-Ohio River waterway:

FACTS ABOUT THE LAKE ERIE-OHIO RIVER WATERWAY

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Lake Erie-Ohio River Waterway would connect up the Great Lakes with the Ohio River, a distance of 120 miles. This compares with the present route of about 2,400 miles around the Great Lakes to Chicago, down the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers, and up the Ohio River. The new canal, together with linking up the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers, would also complete a vital 1,745 mile through waterway, now 80 percent complete, from Cleveland to Mobile.

PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

This project was authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935, in the following terms:

"That the following works of improvement of rivers, harbors, and other waterways are hereby adopted and authorized, * * *:

"Beaver and Mahoning Rivers, Pennsylvania and Ohio; of the width and depth provided in House Document Numbered 277, Seventy-Third Congress, as a Federal project and to continue to Lake Erie at or near Ash-tabula, Ohio, subject to the final approval of the whole project from the Ohio River to

Lake Erie by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors; * * *

In its report of December 20, 1938 (House Document 178, 76th Congress, 1st Session) the Board of Engineers stated that:

"The Board now concludes that the whole project from the Ohio River to Lake Erie, with certain modifications of the plans proposed in House Document No. 277, Seventy-Third Congress, Second Session, is economically justified."

After a careful review of the matter, Congressman Joseph J. Mansfield, then Chairman of the River and Harbor Committee of the House, in a letter dated April 15, 1939, to the Chief of Engineers stated:

"It is obvious, likewise, that the Board did approve the whole project from the Ohio River to Lake Erie via the Beaver and Mahoning Rivers, and consequently the authorization enacted by Congress in the 1935 River and Harbor Act has been fully met, and the approval and authorization by Congress are complete."

A current economic reevaluation of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Project has been completed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. It has again concluded that the project is fully justified. The Board's recommendations in its report dated September 7, 1966, are as follows:

"The Board concludes that the whole project from the Ohio River to Lake Erie is economically justified and accordingly recommends it for construction substantially in accordance with the plan of the District Engineer, with channel depths of 12 feet, except in the restricted reaches through Youngstown and Warren, Ohio, where a depth of 15 feet would be provided, and with such further modifications as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable. * * *"

EFFECT ON WATER QUALITY

In regard to the effect of the project on water quality, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concluded in the report as follows:

"The District Engineer, in estimating the effects of the proposed project on water quality, used data on streamflow requirements furnished by the United States Public Health Service in its report included in Appendix V of the District Engineer's report. He concluded that additional flows under canalized conditions would result in temperature reduction in the Mahoning River the value of which would slightly exceed the adverse effect resulting from the reduction in the assimilation ability of the river under pool conditions. A restatement of the United States Public Health Service's position subsequently furnished the Division Engineer concludes that if the storage in Grand River Reservoir is used to increase the average minimum flow in the Mahoning River at Youngstown by approximately 200 cubic feet per second, the proposed waterway would not have an adverse effect on water quality. The Division Engineer believes that this condition can be met. Therefore, the analysis concerning water quality contained in the District Engineer's report is considered to be acceptable."

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the gentleman that we have heard a lot from the Ohio folks and the Pennsylvania folks, but I would like to point out that this project has a much broader aspect than just those two sections of our country. This canal along with the canal that will link up the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers offers the greatest potential to the east-

ern part of this country of anything that I know, because when that great day comes that these canals are completed, the commerce of this Nation will be able to proceed from the Gulf of Mexico to Lake Erie and to the St. Lawrence Seaway—between the great port of Mobile on the south and the many cities in the north and east.

I think this is one of the finest projects overall that we could find to make this missing link complete and it is one that we ought to complete as soon as we can. Both the Ohio-Lake Erie Waterway and the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway are important to the future development of this Nation.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] and the distinguished chairman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

This is much more than a local matter. The great inland waterway system that we are building in this country is incomparable. There is nothing like it anywhere on this earth. Today through our inland waterway system, we can go from the Mexican border to the great port of New Orleans, and then from there to Florida, and up the eastern coast. We have also the great St. Lawrence Seaway project which is growing rapidly every day. The project pending connects the Great Lakes and the Ohio River which flows down into the Mississippi and through the great inland system of our country. I think this is a matter of great foresight and vision that we should approve this project.

The work of the great Member from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] in building our country is known to every American. His work will be a monument to him and to the Congress long after all of us are gone.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I very seldom take the floor and interpose my thoughts when there is a struggle of giants on the floor.

But as I sat today listening to this debate, I felt compelled to say just a few words.

I wonder if the Members of this House realize that by the year 2000 the population of this Nation is expected to go from 195 million to 362 million people. Just think of this great increase in 34 years. From the time of Christ up to 1965, the world's population grew from 250 million people to 3 billion. In the next three decades, in the next 34 years, it is going to increase to 6 billion people according to the population experts.

When we talk about a project like this, we are looking to the future. We all

remember that in the Book of Proverbs it says, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." Today we are challenged to exercise our vision.

I want to pay tribute today to the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN. For more than three decades as a member of the Interior Subcommittee and the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations he has been bringing projects to this floor to build America.

I want you to cast your eyes on the words engraved in marble right above the Speaker's desk:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Those words were uttered by Daniel Webster over 130 years ago on the floor of the Congress. They are just as true today as they were 130 years ago. Let us in our day do something so that future generations will say it was done for their present, and their future.

How many hundreds of millions, how many billions of dollars of projects has MIKE KIRWAN and his committee members brought to the floor of this House over the past three decades for the people of America, all of America—not for Youngstown, Ohio—but for Florida, California, Mississippi, and for every State in this Nation?

I would say this much. Those words that were said by Daniel Webster 130 years ago have had no more worthy exponent than MIKE KIRWAN, and the projects that he has sponsored and brought to this floor and pushed through against opposition, shortsighted opposition in many instances, will be remembered long after every Member of this House has gone, a living and breathing monument serving the future, the children of America that are yet to be born. I say this is no time for shortsightedness. This is a time for vision. This is a time for dedication to the great future which America is going to have. Today our responsibility is to see that that future is made secure by starting projects like this and like many other projects in our Nation, which are an investment in America. They are not expenditures. They will bring back in cash far more than we are putting into them. They are investments.

Over 50 years ago we built with our own bonds a canal from Hoover Dam into southern California, at a cost of \$500 million. I asked the engineers last year what it would cost us today. They said it would cost us probably \$1,750 million. If we do not build this canal now, what will it cost us when the time comes that we have to build it to take care of the needs of America?

The investments we make in our future will cost less today than 10 or 20 years from now.

Let us get on with the building of the real wealth producing facilities our great and growing population will badly need.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I request that all debate on the amendment,

and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has asked unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment to this paragraph, and all amendments thereto, be concluded in 10 minutes.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I will modify my request to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto be concluded in 15 minutes?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observes standing the following Members: Mr. KIRWAN, of Ohio, Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, Mr. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABERNETHY, of Mississippi, Mr. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania, Mr. EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, Mr. WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, Mr. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, Mr. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, and Mr. BOLAND, of Massachusetts.

The Chair recognizes for 1 minute the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the administration can postpone or cancel its reported plan to increase personal income taxes after the November elections if Congress will delete funds for such totally unnecessary projects as the proposed Lake Erie to the Ohio River canal. Certainly no one in this House will dispute the fact that a tax rise would be terribly unfair unless every possible economy is employed in Federal expenditures, and here is where conscience and good judgment are needed to come to the defense of fiscal responsibility.

The hour is late, but it is incumbent upon members of both parties to make a last-ditch stand against the unauthorized canal project that in this bill carries a half-million-dollar price tag merely for planning and design—a blueprint that would open U.S. Treasury floodgates to permit more than a billion dollars to flow down the drain of extravagance and irresponsibility on a project that is no more logical than a stairway to the ocean floor.

By practicing a measure of frugality, the administration need not pursue its covert design for higher taxes to take effect after the polls are closed on November 8, nor would it be necessary to deprive industry of the investment tax credit that has stimulated business and created fabulous employment opportunities since it was adopted under President Kennedy. Eliminating the tax credit to obtain revenue for such ridiculous schemes as the Ohio canal would constitute a dual blow to the economy of central and western Pennsylvania. Steel companies, which are basic to the well-being of our region, would feel the deadly impact of the tax credit moratorium and at the same time suffer an unfair competitive burden if rival industries in Ohio are to enjoy the advantage of a transportation system subsidized by the Federal Government.

I insist, Mr. Chairman, that this waterway and every other project that is not essential or can wait for more favorable fiscal conditions should be stricken as a

buffer against both the proposed and the presumed changes in the tax structure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I am not a railroader, I am not an engineer, but I am a taxpayer. I hate to see public money thrown down in a ditch to connect up waterways that are already connected by rail and highway. There is no missing link between Lake Erie and Pittsburgh.

There are more than adequate transportation facilities right now. Even if this canal is built, to try to draw an analogy between it and the canalization of the Ohio and the Mississippi is just not feasible.

Our steel mills in the area around Pittsburgh could not use this facility without building new docks, new storage facilities, and the like. I hope the amendment is agreed to and that we will not have to fight this fight every year to stop our own blunders.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, it would take me considerably more than a minute to express my approval of this particular project, and its sponsor, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WILLIAMS yielded his time to Mr. ABERNETHY.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join the gentleman in supporting this project. The cost of this project, as I understand it, is in the vicinity of \$1 billion. Yesterday this House voted approximately four times that much to throw away in Europe and all over the world.

The cost of this entire project would not run the foreign aid program more than 3 months, and would be of permanent benefit to the people of America. I think the project has merit, and I support it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has just made the point I wanted to make.

In addition to that, the gentleman from California, [Mr. HOLIFIELD] spoke so eloquently about the sponsor of this project, MIKE KIRWAN. MIKE KIRWAN will go down in history as one of the great builders of this Nation. He has been the inspiration behind public works projects benefitting people in every State in this Union. The projects, which he has helped to bring to the Congress and which he has supported, have improved the economy of every district of every Member in this House.

I also would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and the gentlemen from Alabama [Mr. JONES and Mr. EDWARDS], and others, regarding the association of the

Erie-Ohio Waterway with the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.

Both of them are missing links in the inland waterways of this country. They ought to be built. They will pay for themselves. They will improve the economy of every man, woman and child in this land.

We have the opportunity to take the first step here today. Both will get a start under this bill. We are quite confident the Corps of Engineers will come forward with a good feasibility report of Tennessee-Tombigbee, in which event money in this bill will be available for planning, the first step before actual construction. The committee report makes this quite clear.

I hope the amendment will be voted down, so that we may get on with these two very worthy projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I enjoyed the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], about the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

I take no words of praise away from my distinguished colleague from Ohio, but we from western Pennsylvania—that is every Member from the western Pennsylvania delegation, both Senators and the Governor—know exactly what our economic conditions are in our area. That is what we are fighting for today, for better economic conditions in our own State.

We realize that this canal is not going to be any good to us economically.

We are not fighting the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. We realize he is a great and distinguished American.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to add anything that has not already been said with regard to this issue, but I believe we have an issue which is crystal clear if we believe in building the Nation.

With all the sympathy in the world for the situation of the people of western Pennsylvania, I do not believe we would advance the cause of western Pennsylvania by blocking progress in the State of Ohio. If there is a feasible project which is needed to develop the Ohio Basin and to tie it into our inland waterway system more effectively, to my way of thinking it makes good business to do it.

I do not know a better authority anywhere in the United States, in or out of any professional organization, on the subject of waterway development than the gentleman from Ohio, who is the chairman of the subcommittee. He has practically dedicated his life to studying the matter. That is the gentleman we know and love whose name is MIKE KIRWAN. He is loved in Oklahoma for what he has done for water resource development there, and no one questions his knowledge and leadership in the water development field.

If there were no other authority supporting this project than the gentleman from Ohio I would be for it. However, this is a project that the Army Engineers also agree is a good one, and the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. KIRWAN, and Mr. BOLAND yielded their time to Mr. BLATNIK.)

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time being yielded to me by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and by my dear friends and able colleagues.

The case has been well presented by the opposition. It is what we have heard repeatedly, as to nearly every major project which has come before this body. Any such project usually is one involving quite a bit of controversy.

If I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, out of a perhaps limited experience—and certainly so when compared to the third of a century our beloved and respected chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], has had in regard to public works—may I try to be fairly objective and to review and to bring to the attention of Members of this body the procedure through which the Corps of Engineers considers these projects.

It is true that this project was initially authorized in 1935, more than 31 years ago. It was reviewed in 1938 and in 1939 and the then chairman of the House River and Harbor Committee confirmed that approval and authorization of the project by Congress was complete.

Let me bring this up to date, to show the thoroughness with which the Corps of Engineers goes into all projects, big or small, and particularly the big ones.

Five years ago, in 1961, the Congress financed a restudy of this project. It is a long-established practice on projects which have been enacted for a considerable period of years to first require a detailed current economic restudy by the Corps of Engineers. If the final report is favorable, we then proceed with the appropriation to initiate planning. That is exactly what has been done.

For 5 long years, this restudy was conducted and carried out by the Corps of Engineers at the direction of and through an appropriation by the Congress.

The exhaustive study was finally concluded and a report was submitted on September 7, 1966. That report consists of 5 volumes with over 700 pages. Here is what they state in that report, and I quote:

In arriving at its decision the Board—

This is the Board of Engineers—

had before it the favorable recommendations of the Board's Pittsburgh District and Ohio River Division, both of which had extensively studied the proposal and compiled a voluminous record of testimony. The Board not only studied this record and additional information furnished by interested parties during the period of review but also sent its own staff members into the field for on-the-post investigations and thoroughly scrutinized and rechecked all engineering and economic calculations.

The Board again concluded that this project is economically justified and recommended it for construction as was stated, and correctly so, by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Bow]. So, Mr. Chairman, I cite this, not on a personal basis or an emotional basis, but merely to state that it is a sound project. The best authority we have in the United States has officially proclaimed this project to be economically justified and feasible from an engineering standpoint.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the project and the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 6, lines 12 and 13, strike out "\$84,950,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$77,100,000".

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes allotted to me.

The effect of this amendment is to reduce the figure for flood control on the Mississippi River and its tributaries to the figure submitted in the budget document by the President.

I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that no matter what we do with this today, in the light of recent statements by the President, he will actually limit the expenditures for this paragraph to the amount of his budget request. So the only result would be in refusing to adopt this amendment, we have another \$7,850,000 unexpended in this appropriation at the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that some 4 years ago the territory bordering the Mississippi River was added to my district. Much of it will go out of my district on the first of January, but in the 4 years I have had the privilege of representing that area I have gotten to know quite a bit about the river. We fail to realize in this country that the Mississippi River drains approximately one-third of the entire Nation and all of these flood problems in the central part of the United States eventually show up in the lower Mississippi River where they constitute an even bigger threat. What this amendment would do, Mr. Chairman, would be to cut the amount of funds that you had this year to meet the problems of the Mississippi by more than \$7 million. Our committee simply restored the

budget cut so that next year we would have the amount of money available as for this year. There is one thing in this country that does not wait, and that is the Mississippi River. As the engineers have frequently said, you have to learn to work with it. You cannot work against it, because it is too powerful.

For us to follow the Bureau of the Budget and stop, curtail, and to cut back the present operation by \$7 million, would be to invite disaster.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, would the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi agree, from the standpoint of economics, that if we go into the record, it indicates that the cost-benefit ratio is about \$5.10 in benefits to \$1 expended for the Mississippi River and for its lower tributaries?

Mr. WHITTEN. That would be my understanding.

Mr. PASSMAN. And, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that would certainly indicate that this represents a very good investment?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is certainly right, and when the gentleman puts it on a dollars-and-cents basis, of course what is involved, here, if we should permit the Mississippi River to get loose, the loss in life and limb would be hard to measure in terms of dollars. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say it would be penny wise and pound foolish to curtail the proposed works at this time and that the pending amendment should be defeated so that we may continue the program at this year's level as recommended by our committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 11, line 1, strike out "\$14,270,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$13,610,000".

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is simply another amendment along the thought of the one previously offered. It would strike \$660,000 from the funds for general investigations for the Bureau of Reclamation and would result in a figure in the bill which conforms to the amount proposed in the President's budget.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee opposes the amendment and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 11, lines 19 and 20, strike out "\$187,055,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$178,000,000".

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment—this proposed amendment—would reduce the amount for construction and rehabilitation in the Bureau of Reclamation by \$9,055,000. Its effect would be to reduce the amount carried in this bill to the figure submitted by the President of the United States in his budget.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment and that it be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 14, line 6, strike out "\$12,995,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,995,000".

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, if adopted, is to delete the unbudgeted increases in the loan program of the Bureau of Reclamation in the amount of \$3 million. It would restore that figure to the figure submitted by the President in his budget.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The committee considered this amendment during the workup of the bill and rejected it. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 14, line 17, strike out "\$48,948,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$43,050,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, would delete the unbudgeted item of \$5,898,000 for the upper Colorado River storage project of the Bureau of Reclamation. It would restore the item as set forth in the bill to the figure submitted in the President's budget.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would affect the Bonneville unit of Utah of \$4,800,000; the Arizona Page Accommodation School of \$148,000. The committee opposes the amendment. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

CXII—1476—Part 17

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 30, line 1 and 2, strike out "\$63,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$60,700,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the committee has added \$3 million unbudgeted for the Tim's Ford Dam and Reservoir in Tennessee. This item is the Tennessee Valley Authority appropriation. The proposed amendment would delete this unbudgeted increase amount submitted in the President's and would restore the figure to the budget of \$60,700,000.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is incorrect when he says this project—the Tim's Ford project—is not a budgeted item. As a matter of fact, it is a budgeted item. The Tim's Ford Dam is under construction currently by the TVA. The TVA estimated that it could use \$19.7 million, almost \$20 million more than the Budget Bureau recommended. So the amount which the committee has added is less than is needed for this project at this time. It is a very reasonable amount to be included in this bill. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 35, after line 5, insert the following:

"Sec. 511. Each appropriation item contained in this act shall be reduced by five percentum which shall be applied uniformly to each item, project, and activity funded under each appropriation item."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is a proposed general 5-percent cut across the board in this bill which would represent, if approved, a reduction of approximately \$200 million. Such a reduction would, in my opinion, be commensurate with the problems that confront us in providing the necessary funds for the operation of this Government

and in meeting the heavy load of commitments of our country at this time.

This is not an amendment applying to expenditures as have frequently been offered in connection with other appropriation bills, because I do not consider the expenditure limitations to be appropriate for this bill. We do not appropriate for entire projects in a fiscal year in this appropriation measure, rather we attempt to gage the requirements for starting or continuing projects. We attempt to estimate the amount of money that will be needed in the fiscal year to go forward with these projects. So we are not confronted here, as we are with so many departments of the Government, with a heavy backlog of unexpended funds that need to be controlled by this Congress.

It seems more appropriate that, rather than dealing with expenditures, that this proposed amendment deal with the new money that is in this appropriation bill.

I am not a great exponent of the idea of across-the-board cuts as a general proposition. But I think we need to recognize the philosophy of this bill, and this is based in no small measure upon cuts of this kind, in attempting to anticipate slippages and then anticipating the kind of unobligated balances that would be carried over into the next fiscal year.

As I said earlier this afternoon—quite some time ago now—I believe if the President is to carry forward with his announcement that there will be a substantial reduction of expenditures this fiscal year on items other than defense items, I have a suspicion that this is the area in which his proposed limitations of expenditures will heavily apply, and what we will be doing by reducing appropriations here would not be affecting at all the construction work that is going to be done in this fiscal year. They would simply be fulfilling our responsibility of seeing to it that a large amount of money is not carried over into the next fiscal year, money appropriated but unexpended, money over which we have lost control in this body, any semblance of control.

I suggest, in keeping with the philosophy of this bill, that it is proper that we make this 5 percent reduction in the items here, and I must say that I know of no items in this bill that could not be carried forward with a 5 percent reduction such as has been suggested in this amendment.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RESNICK. The question is not on the 5 percent reduction, but on your separate views in the report. You said that you were going to offer an amendment to strike out funds for the Wap-pinger Creek project as a necessary object lesson to those in the Corps of Engineers whose responsibility it is to keep congressional committees informed about new studies. My question is this: There are 435 Congressional Districts in the United States, and countless thousands of projects. I would like to know

why lightning was to strike my own. This is something that was in the budget. It was started in 1955. A \$2.5 million flood hit that area. The people waited very patiently.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for another 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the gentleman is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. The project has been under study and after 1955, when a \$2.5 million flood hit this area. I am just more than curious. I would like to know why the gentleman picked this particular project.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In response to the gentleman, I should say that I felt I had offered as many amendments as the traffic would bear, and I did not offer the amendment that I had prepared to strike funds for the Wappinger Creek project. I think such an amendment would be appropriate, however, inasmuch as the Corps of Engineers did borrow money from other projects and dumped it into this project without keeping the committee advised of that move, as they had an obligation to do. I felt that sometimes the only way you can encourage the cooperation that congressional committees ought to have is to give the people who transgress a slap on the wrist. That amendment I did not offer.

Mr. RESNICK. I would like to point out to the gentleman that the transgressor, if there were any transgressor, would be the Corps of Engineers and not the people of Wappinger Falls. They had nothing to do with this. Still you were going to cut this item out of the bill, and I would like to inform the gentleman the reason I am bringing this up is that there are big, banner headlines in my district about this, and I thought the gentleman might want to know about it.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. The pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is a 5-percent across-the-board cut of the entire bill. The bill is already \$214,600,000 below, or 5 percent below last year. New expenditures in this bill, and hence expenditures for major programs carried in this bill are already reduced by \$323 million, which is 9 percent of the bill accomplished by delays and slippages and taking advantage of the carryover balances.

I ask for a vote on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OTTINGER

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OTTINGER: On page 30, lines 1 and 2, strike out "\$63,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof, "\$60,500,000".

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OTTINGER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to delete from title IV of this public works appropriations bill—H.R. 17787—an unnecessary and, in my opinion, extremely ill-advised \$3.2 million appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority's so-called Tellico Dam project on the Little Tennessee River in southeastern Tennessee, which will end up costing the Federal Government more than \$42 million. This project was previously rejected by this House.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, the objections to this appropriation are sixfold.

First, the project is not necessary. No one has ever claimed that it is needed for the development of water resources or flood control. There are 22 impoundments within a 50-mile radius of the site.

The power applications of Tellico Dam, which TVA pegged at 200 million kilowatt-hours a year, will not make a ripple in the 73.3 billion kilowatt-hours that TVA produces today.

This tricity area—Loudon, Monroe, and Blount—is not a dying or depressed region that needs Federal subsidy, but one of thriving prosperity. The economic activity is above the average for the State.

The relief and welfare burden is below the State and national average.

Second, the project is not wanted.

More than 42 local and 12 national conservation organizations are adamantly opposed to it. These organizations are listed on pages 22986-22987 of the RECORD for Monday, September 19, and I feel that I should point out to this body that the local Indian tribe involved in this dam project is opposed as is the local chapter of the DAR and the local chamber of commerce.

I do not know where Mr. Goldwater stands.

I have received numerous letters from local residents, not one of them favoring the project. It is opposed by such newspapers as the Chattanooga News Free-Press and the Knoxville Journal—in an area where opposition to TVA projects is as unusual as it is politically hazardous.

Third, the Tellico Dam project is primarily a real estate speculation which will have the TVA condemn at least 30,000 acres of private property in order to sell 5,000 acres at a "profit" to private industry.

And the whole success of the venture hinges on this.

The aim of this project is to lure industry from other regions, other constituencies, to southeastern Tennessee—and as far as I can tell, not even the residents of the area want it.

Fourth, the Tellico Dam project is a very bad business risk.

A similar project at Melton Hill, about 50 miles away, has so far been a rather dramatic failure. There, TVA condemned 1,000 acres 3 years ago, and has sold only 25 acres, as of now. TVA claims that this is different, but they really do not say how—and I feel that there should be a clear record before we commit \$42 million of the taxpayers' money to this scheme.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am very much disturbed at the extent to which the Federal Government is sneaking into industrial development programs in competition with private enterprise, hiding behind the name of "conservation" and "water resource development." TVA ought not to be in this kind of business venture at all, and certainly not at this time of mounting inflation, when it is urgent that we curtail Federal expenditures.

Fifth, the Tellico Dam project will unnecessarily destroy a rich fishery resource and submit one of the few unspoiled stretches of this river to the tender mercies of the bulldozer and the engineer.

Sixth, this project will contribute to pollution. The fact is that all the experts admit that this stretch of the Little Tennessee is now extraordinarily pure and abounding with marine life. When the project is complete, these pure waters will be connected to Fort Loudon Lake, which, I am informed, is the most heavily polluted in the TVA system, and this new filth will pour into the Little Tennessee.

Is this the wise resource planning this Congress wants to be remembered for?

Soon we will be considering a multi-billion-dollar appropriation to clean up just such a mess as we are being asked to make at Tellico Dam.

Is this sound planning?

TVA is planning to acquire more than 30,000 acres. Of this, more than 14,000 acres of farmlands, woodlands, scenic roads, historic landmarks and some 5,000 existing acres of prime industrial sites, will be inundated and lost forever, just to get 5,000 industrial sites.

Is this wise planning?

Congress rejected this plan last year. There is no new justification for it now.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, let me remind my colleagues of the President's admonition to Congress yesterday when he signed the parcel post bill.

He said that he had been asked whether there would be a tax increase this year and he turned to us and said, in essence, "tell me what the bill will be."

Right now we have sent the President bills which I am informed exceed his budget by \$2 billion.

We must stop this pyramid of Federal spending.

The \$42 million in this project may seem small to some, but spending programs are made up of little bills, little appropriations, and \$42 million is not insignificant in this pattern.

We can only stop it, if we stop it now.

I urge my colleagues to vote for sanity and restraint now and approve this amendment to delete the unneeded and

harmful Tellico Dam project from this appropriations act.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

The time has come for action on the proposed Tellico project of the Tennessee Valley Authority on the Little Tennessee River and for an end to what have seemed to be interminable debates over peripheral questions which have been answered over and over again. It is time we approved this initial appropriation for the start of construction and let TVA get on with the job.

It is a project which studies over and over again have shown to have great potential in promoting industrial development and hence more jobs and more income in an area which is largely agricultural and which now offers little opportunity to attract and hold aggressive and educated young people, even though they are born there and would like to remain.

Despite the objections raised it is clear to me that the project enjoys wide majority support among the people in the area. This has been shown time after time in newspaper polls, in my own polls through questionnaires, in mail from residents of the region, in resolutions passed by responsible bodies of concerned citizens.

Very briefly, this project involves construction of a dam across the Little Tennessee River near its mouth, where it joins the Tennessee River just downstream from TVA's Fort Loudoun Dam. It will involve also a short canal which will connect the Fort Loudoun and Tellico Reservoirs and allow them to be operated virtually as a single reservoir. It will be a valuable addition to TVA's multiple-use system of dams and reservoirs. It will make the system more effective for flood control by more than doubling the flood storage at the point on the Tennessee River system. The flow of the Little Tennessee, divested through the turbines at the Fort Loudoun Dam powerhouse, will add to the output of electricity to serve the needs of the Tennessee Valley region.

And of primary importance, it would make the Little Tennessee River navigable for many miles upstream, to areas favorable for industrial plant sites—industries which are needed to further the economic growth of the area.

It has been objected that the Tellico project would destroy trout fishing waters. But it has been shown that good trout fishing exists mainly in the upper end of the stretch of river which would not be affected by the Tellico project, and this area would still provide good trout fishing while the reservoir which would be created would expand the general fishing and recreation opportunities in the region.

The Little Tennessee is not a free flowing river. It is controlled by several dams upstream on the river or its tributaries. The largest of these is TVA's

Fontana Dam, the others are owned by the Aluminum Co. of America.

It is not a natural trout stream. Trout do not reproduce in this stretch of the river, but cold water released from Fontana Reservoir permits the State to stock and fisherman to enjoy trout fishing over some 14 miles of the river immediately below Alcoa's Chilhowee Dam.

Trout fishing will not be destroyed by construction of Tellico Dam. The mileage where it is now available will be reduced, but if the State continues to stock as generously as in the past, about 4 miles below Chilhowee will provide habitat for trout as attractive as now existing. This is the area of most frequent use now, and there will be some trout fishing farther downstream.

It should be remembered that for trout fishing this stream is not natural or unique. The opportunity was created by construction of Fontana Dam. It is maintained by stocking. It exists in a region that boasts 1,500 miles of trout streams. And it will not be destroyed. In exchange for the river mileage lost to trout fishing other kinds of fishing, attractive to a larger number of people, will be vastly improved, and other benefits provided.

It was a fairly typical east Tennessee stream, and early Alcoa impoundments did not materially affect the fish population of the river, which included bass, catfish, sunfish, and other warm-water species. But with the construction of 480-foot-high Fontana Dam, enough cold water was stored to maintain cool water temperatures favorable for trout growth, but not for reproduction, all the way downstream. The best of this trout water existed just below Calderwood Dam, some 17 miles below Fontana, until Alcoa's Chilhowee Dam was completed in 1957. The habitat was ideal and trout growth rates below Calderwood sometimes exceeded those achieved in hatchery ponds. The most favorable trout water now is found in the first few miles below Chilhowee.

Thus, the trout fishery on the Little Tennessee was created by dam construction. It is maintained by stocking. For example, in 1964 the Tennessee Game and Fish Commission stocked 460,000 trout of various sizes. The year before, 74,000 trout were stocked in the lower Little Tennessee. By comparison, the Clinch River tailwaters below TVA's Norris Dam—another cold-water area made suitable for trout because of dam construction—were stocked with only 35,000 trout in 1963 and with 31,000 in 1964.

In winter and early spring white bass and sauger run up the Little Tennessee out of Watts Bar Reservoir on the main stream of the Tennessee. The overall fish population of the Little Tennessee below Chilhowee Dam now consists of about 11 percent trout, 12 percent other game species, and 77 percent rough or commercial species such as buffalo, drum, mooneye, and shad.

Tellico Lake would be ideal for bass, crappie, and sauger, and fishing of this type, in which many more people engage, would increase enormously.

This dam would not eliminate trout fishing on the river. The 3 or 4 miles below Chilhowee would provide just as good trout fishing as it does now and considerable habitat for trout would exist further downstream in the Tellico impoundment. Fishing for warm-water species would be very greatly improved. TVA estimates the number of fishing trips in the new lake would be about 150,000 per year.

The trout waters in question occur in a region that now boasts 1,500 miles of trout stream. The Tennessee Game and Fish Commission and the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission report 600 miles of trout stream in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, 300 miles in the Little Tennessee headwaters in North Carolina, 450 miles in the Cherokee National Forest of Tennessee, and 150 miles in nearby reservoirs and tributaries.

LAND DISPOSAL

In disposing of the shoreland along Tellico Reservoir, TVA will not be venturing into real estate "speculation." TVA has always disposed of land surplus to its requirements. The original TVA Act specified procedures to be followed, and during its life TVA has sold about 160,000 acres for a variety of uses. Industries and suburban developments are now located on land sold by TVA, while parks, playgrounds, picnic and camping areas will be found on over 180,000 acres which TVA has transferred to public agencies for recreation.

Experience has demonstrated that for any given area the economic benefits of the public investment in dams and reservoirs depend to a large degree on the way the shoreland is developed. In the case of Tellico the experience of 30 years will be applied. Where terrain is suitable for construction and highway and rail connections are available, areas will be set aside for industrial development. Other stretches of the shoreland will be used for recreation or residential development. The value of the land, now used largely for farming, will be enhanced by the public investment. As it is sold by TVA, the added value, estimated at some \$10 million, will be recaptured and paid into the Federal Treasury, offsetting in part the cost to the Treasury of the project which created the value. Total cost of the project is estimated at \$42 million.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Using a canal between Fort Loudoun and Tellico Reservoirs a navigation channel of 33 miles on the Little Tennessee will be provided, without the necessity of adding locks at Tellico Dam.

Without installing generators at Tellico, some 200 million kilowatt-hours will be added to the annual power generation at Fort Loudoun Dam. With construction of Tellico 126,000 acre-feet of flood storage will be added to the TVA system. The tremendous value of the shoreland for recreation and industrial development in the immediate area is in addition to these great benefits to the region as a whole.

It has been contended that this stretch of the stream should be preserved as a "wild river." But there is nothing "wild" about it, for the flow of the river is controlled by a number of upstream dams, including those of an aluminum company and TVA's giant Fontana Dam. In delaying funds for starting the project last year, the Congress suggested that additional studies be made of the possibility that pollution from Fort Loudoun Reservoir would contaminate the reservoir on the Little Tennessee. The studies have confirmed that by the time the waters reach Fort Loudoun Dam, the pollution from upstream has been largely dissipated—and in any case the flow of water would for the most part be from Tellico into Fort Loudoun Lake.

I might take a different view if this were a new or hastily conceived project. But it is not; it has been under study for a score of years. In fact, the Congress provided funds for the project—then known as the Fort Loudoun Dam extension—in 1943, and it was postponed only because of wartime priorities on materials and manpower.

In the ensuing years, TVA has conscientiously made additional studies which have confirmed the economic value of the development. I doubt that any project has been more thoroughly studied and explored from every conceivable angle. The facts are all in, including all those which could be mustered by the small groups carrying on a bitter-end campaign against it.

And these facts point to the need and value of the Tellico project as a means of economic advancement for the region. They are facts which are convincing to the majority of the people in the area and have elicited their support for beginning the project now. That is why the entire appropriation for the TVA should be approved by the Congress.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SAYLOR. I object.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the amendment of my colleague from New York, and in support of this amendment I would like to read an editorial from the Chattanooga News-Free Press of September 16, 1966, which states this as well as any person can. The title of the editorial is "Just Not Needed."

JUST NOT NEEDED

Just below Chattanooga, work is progressing on the Nickajack Dam. This is an example of a dam that is needed, is fully justified, that is reasonable in concept and execution.

It is to replace the present Hale's Bar Dam, that has been undermined by water leaks through porous limestone formations. Nickajack also will provide huge locks to allow better use of the Tennessee River by shipping that currently is bottlenecked at Hale's Bar.

In sharp contrast with demonstrable need for Nickajack Dam is the proposal for building the Tellico Dam on the Little Tennessee River.

Perhaps you have heard most about the Tellico Dam as a result of the protests of nature lovers, conservationists and fishermen who lament that the Tellico Dam would destroy one of the last natural rivers in our section. In addition, there is the stronger point that there is no real need for the Tellico Dam.

It is not justified by power production needs. It is not justified by navigation demands. It is not supported as a flood control measure. The only significant argument that is made for the Tellico Dam is that it would open new industrial sites. This is a poor argument when (1) there are many, many available industrial sites in the area that are not yet in use, and (2) it is not the business of the Federal Government to take the role of real estate developer.

It appears that the real reason behind the Tellico Dam is that its proponents just have run out of something else to do for the time being. Just yesterday, the House Appropriations Committee approved expenditure of three million dollars to start the project—a small forerunner of many millions of your dollars that would follow.

Here is one excellent example of a wise place to cut expenditures in this time of galloping inflation, wasteful Federal spending, deficit financing and costly war.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] be approved.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment. The proposed Tellico Dam falls well outside the criteria which I have used since coming to Congress to determine my support for big-dam projects. These criteria include the basic economic feasibility of the project, the general condition of the Federal budget—that is, the priority rating for the project, its effect upon natural resources, whether it would compete with equal services provided by private industry, whether the same job could be done by other means, for instance with smaller dams, and generally, whether there is any real need for the projected services to be provided.

The Tellico Dam project, tested against these criteria, emphatically should be rejected. It joins a number of other projects which I believe should be rejected because they cannot meet the test of these criteria. This list includes the proposed Grand Canyon dams; the Lincoln-Dickey Dam in Maine and the Livermore Falls and Baker River Dams in New Hampshire, in my district. To this list must now be added the Tellico Dam on the Little Tennessee River.

Tellico, however, contains an additional feature for which perhaps I shall have to establish a new standard by which to measure these projects. The Tellico project proposes to put the Government into the land-speculation business in a quite unprecedented manner.

This project failed to get the approval of the TVA Board of Directors in 1961 because of an unfavorable cost-benefit ratio. Its supporters went back to the drawing board and returned with this proposal under which more than a third of the benefits were assigned to a wholly new category, "industrial development."

The new plan proposes to condemn 21,000 acres of land for resale at an estimated profit of \$10.9 million. The land condemnation was not part of the original plan. It is obvious that the traditional concepts of flood control, navigation, and power production were insufficient to establish a favorable cost-benefit ratio.

How the estimated profit figure is reached I have no idea, but it would seem to be the result of very shaky guesswork. How can anyone predict the demand for land or the price for which it could possibly be sold at any given time? As a matter of fact, I am informed that there are already available 13 waterfront industrial sites near Tellico which are as yet unused. Thus, it is very doubtful procedure to assume a demand for the proposed additional sites or that such a demand would produce a profit of \$10.9 million.

Even if these figures are proved to be accurate, this speculative approach is no way in which to justify a major Federal project that would cost well over \$40 million. Congress ought to nip in the bud this dangerous departure from sound public works planning. I am almost certain that if this were not a TVA project and had to come through my Committee on Public Works that the committee would flatly reject such a speculative plan.

Thus, the project cannot be justified through the traditional standards of cost-benefit ratios but must rely on a most questionable and speculative venture into real estate development. Beyond that, the Tellico project would commit positive damage to the area. It would eliminate some 10,000 acres of fine bottom land producing agricultural products worth \$3 million annually. It would liquidate 15,600 acres of forest land, dropping total taxable forest wealth in the area by an estimated \$2 million, and eliminate an estimated 156 forest jobs.

Not the least of the positive damage would be the destruction of one of the Nation's finest trout rivers. Major tourist attractions and historic sites are threatened by this unjustified project.

Mr. Chairman, I am no opponent of all big dams per se, but let us exercise the greatest of care in authorizing them. Let us make sure they are really needed and meet the technical standards that have served us well in the past and which have been developed through long years of experience. Let us weigh their effects upon our dwindling natural resources. Let us reject the Tellico proposal.

The President is seeking ways to cut the budget in an effort to quench the fires of inflation. This project is an ideal place to swing the economy ax.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] designed to delete funds in this legislation for construction of the Tellico Dam and Reservoir. I say so in spite of the deep respect and admiration which I feel for my distinguished friend from Ten-

nessee [Mr. EVINS] who had served in this body so long and so well and who so strongly supports this provision of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that we ought to take a careful look at the legislation which is now pending before us and the proposal for the Tellico Dam.

Mr. Chairman, the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority has on a number of occasions pointed out the fact that there is no longer a need for flood control structures on the Tennessee River. It has been pointed out that the amount of power to be developed with respect to this structure is so small as to be insignificant. It is only 200,000 kilowatt hours out of a total of 73,368 million kilowatt hours available in the Tennessee Valley Authority jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, if approved, this project would produce less than 2 percent of the total amount of power available from the Kingston steam plant.

Mr. Chairman, what is really involved here is an effort to seize from the people throughout that area 30,000 acres and to create 5,000 acres in additional land for industrial sites. Many more acres in industrial sites will be flooded. There are abundantly available thousands of acres in the near vicinity. Thousands of acres of industrial lands are presently available, all within a very few miles. All of these have a larger and a more skilled work force available, and with more roads and highways and other connections available.

These same kinds of lands are presently going idle in the area for want of buyers and purchasers and users.

Let us take a further look at this. The cost-benefit ratio is 1.4 to 1, but the bulk of the benefit in the cost-benefit ratio comes from the fact that land is going to be condemned cheaply from people in the area who do not desire to sell this land, and to resell it at more cost, according to the Tennessee Valley Authority for a profit in excess of \$2,000 per acre. I say this is unjustified. If there is need for the Tellico project in the future, the land will be there, the stream will be there and we will be able to engage in the process of seizing and condemning the land and constructing the facilities.

It might be well to point out to this body that I have constantly supported the Tennessee Valley Authority and I have on occasions taken this well to defend the Tennessee Valley Authority rather than to criticize it—and I have been severely criticized in my district for my support of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Let me point out to my colleagues that what is involved here is not a project to benefit the area, not a project to improve navigation, not a project to create industrial sites, but a device simply to take land away from people, resell it at a high price and make a profit in creating industrial sites from this land.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes a great point of the fact that he supported the TVA

with great pains to the constituents he is representing in the House. I would like to remind the gentleman from Michigan, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works on Flood Control that I, too, have supported projects beyond the boundaries of my district, much to the pains of my constituency.

I would think it would be rather awkward not to proceed on the basis that these are national assets and therefore they require our consideration.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct, and if there was a legitimate basis for the kind of ruthless seizure of land, to provide for construction of a national asset I would support it too. I cannot support profiteering by a public agency so little justified.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is the opinion of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I did not yield to the gentleman from Alabama and I will ask for regular order. But I do want to point out to my friend from Alabama—and he is my friend and I value his friendship very highly as a distinguished Member of this body—that what is involved here is not the creation of needed industrial sites, not the creation of needed navigation, not the creation of flood control facilities, because all of these issues are of the most minimum value with regard to the project here.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to give my support to the amendment of the gentleman from New York deleting funds from H.R. 17787 for the construction of the Tellico Dam and Reservoir project of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Lest it be thought that this effort to bar spending of \$3.2 million on the Tellico project is only an effort of outsiders to interfere with TVA matters, I want to say that I have been much impressed by the scope and depth of opposition to the Tellico project among Tennesseans themselves. I have received numerous letters and phone calls from people in the TVA area urging me to aid in the preservation of the Little Tennessee River as it now is. I have heard not only from conservation groups, but also from farm organizations, timber producers, livestockmen, civic groups, and many just plain citizens.

The organizations and citizens from whom I have heard are not out to cripple TVA—and neither am I. We do feel, however, that TVA this time is trying to push through a project which is unwanted, unneeded, and unjustified. It would be just too costly in terms of money as well as in terms of the great sacrifice of nature's largess.

As we all know, TVA operates under a set of rules differing somewhat from those applying to other dam-building agencies such as the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. TVA does not need to get prior authorization for its projects. Instead of going to a legislative committee first, TVA goes directly to the Appropriations Committee—which means the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee. This subcommittee has an imposing task and is a diligent and hard-working unit of the House.

The subcommittee had done a good and thorough job of questioning TVA witnesses on the project. It has heard from public witnesses. However, the subcommittee—burdened as it is with a great many projects involving several agencies already cleared by legislative committees—simply cannot give the attention to a single project that such project would receive if it went through the authorization process. I am confident that the Tellico project would not be before this House now if it had been closely scrutinized by the legislative committees. And particularly not at a time when the Federal Government is seeking to hold down inflationary spending.

TVA claims a 1.4 to 1 benefit-cost ratio for Tellico. But the agency's figures look a bit "fishy" to me. I will not argue much with the claims of \$11.4 million in navigational benefits or \$8 million in electric power benefits, but I feel differently about the claim of \$13.7 million for flood control benefits and \$48.1 million for general economic development benefits. TVA last year claimed only \$10.4 million for flood control benefits, but boosted this figure to \$13.7 million because of an inflation in the projected values of property and real estate. TVA inflated these values without boosting its cost figures for land acquisition.

The \$48.1 million in general economic development benefits seems to be a somewhat contrived figure when you consider that the total consists in part of the profit to be derived from acquiring land on the basis of its value as agricultural land and selling it on the basis of industrial sites. TVA wants to condemn some 5,000 acres of land which it would resell at a profit of \$2,180 per acre—or a total of \$10.9 million. This profit would reduce estimated project costs of \$42.5 million to \$31.6 million. Taking of this land would probably bring TVA a nice profit, but such condemnations are not necessary—local people tell me there is more than enough other land available for industrial sites.

Another matter which disturbs me greatly is that the Tellico Dam would ruin one of the best trout fishing resources in the country. The section of the Little Tennessee which would be inundated probably can support more trout fishing than any other stream in the area, due to its large size and constant cold temperatures resulting from several upstream impoundments. Existing trout stream mileage in the area has been declining at an alarming rate, while 18 major reservoirs within a 50-mile radius offer adequate lake-type fishing. The Little Tennessee is almost unique as a producer of trout. Enough trophy-size brown trout from this river already have been entered in national competition to dominate the eastern division contests next year.

Earlier this year, the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, of which I am chairman, held hearings on a bill relating to TVA's exemption from the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. While TVA witnesses claimed that the agency coordinated its

activities with other Federal and State fish and wildlife agencies, I found little, if any, of such coordination on the Tellico project. I am quite impressed by the position of the Tennessee Game and Fish Commission adamantly opposing the Tellico project.

In short, I think Congress—if it approves funds for the Tellico project—would be trading away a fine natural asset of national importance for the construction of a dam for which neither the need nor utility have been satisfactorily demonstrated.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I rise in opposition to the Ottinger amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman the hour is getting late and I do not wish to trespass on your time. I rise in opposition to the pending amendment to strike from this bill funds to begin construction of Tellico Dam by Tennessee Valley Authority.

I support the position of the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and members of the Committee on Appropriations.

This amendment should be defeated.

The position of the committee should be sustained.

This \$3.2 million carried in the bill for Tellico Dam is a budgeted item.

The committee has held extensive hearings on this matter.

The committee has gone into every angle and every facet at great detail and great length.

The issues of Tellico have been long and thoroughly discussed and debated.

Last year when the committee considered this project—then, as now, a budgeted item—the committee deferred action for three basic reasons.

First. The project was then considered highly controversial. Now the controversy has been largely resolved. The county courts and the elected officials in the majority of the counties of the area have passed resolutions favoring and supporting this project.

Second. The question raised regarding the possible pollution of the Little Tennessee River has now been resolved. The TVA has prepared a special report following a study ordered on this issue by our committee.

The report negates the charge that the Little Tennessee River would become a polluted river.

This report has resolved the issue on this complaint.

Third. The committee delayed action because of the charge then made that the historic site of Fort Loudoun would be inundated. TVA has made provisions in its plans to preserve Fort Loudoun, the most important of the historical markers. The site of the British fort built in 1756 will be preserved.

There will be more visitors to that historic site than ever before as a result of construction of the dam.

So, Mr. Chairman, the criticisms have been answered to the satisfaction of historians and other persons concerned.

The remaining opposition to the project comes from some of our friends who are sport fishermen.

Most of us like to feel we are sport fishermen.

I regret that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] did not have the advantage and the opportunity of hearing all the facts on the Tellico project.

The members of our subcommittee have had the benefit of testimony and witnesses from all sides and all groups.

We have studied the matter thoroughly and resolved the issue on the side of who would be most benefited.

We concluded that it is more important to provide 7,000 jobs in an area where low income and high unemployment prevail over the pleasures of a few fishermen.

I can understand the concern of these sportsmen. I appreciate their position. I have no criticism of them. They are concerned with only one dimension of the picture.

There has been a heavy out-migration of population from the area because of the lack of job opportunities—particularly among young people.

Census figures show that an out-migration of 15,523 persons occurred in the 10-year period from 1950 to 1960.

The combination of abundant rainfall and the steep mountainous area makes the Tellico project an excellent area for the production of hydroelectric power.

Tellico will produce 200 million kilowatts of electric power annually.

For purposes of comparison this compares with more than one-half the annual power output of Norris Dam.

The power benefits are estimated at \$8 million. Flood control benefits are estimated at \$13.7 million. Transportation benefits, resulting from creation of a waterway, will amount to \$11.4 million. It is a conservative estimate that the general economic development will be increased by about \$15 million.

The cost-benefit ratio is a good one—\$1.40 will be returned for every \$1 expended in the life of the project.

Contrary to the statements of the opponents of this project, there is no intention of moving industries to the area from elsewhere.

It is anticipated that some new plants will be built and branch plants established.

This has been the history of the building of hydroelectric plants throughout the Nation by the Corps of Engineers, the TVA, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other resource development agencies.

The Tellico project will afford the advantages of low-cost electric power—available water and rail transportation—and industrial sites suitable for industries having large land requirements.

Concerning the charge of the purchase of surplus land for resale, it has been the custom in the past to purchase land in the areas of these developments and these lands are resold to the public and private interests.

Approximately 7,000 new jobs are estimated to be provided by the project and wages and salaries are estimated at \$18 million a year over present employment opportunities.

The recreation potential for the area also will be increased for the benefit of sports fishermen and others. I would point out that a survey of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service together with the Tennessee State Game and Fish Commission and the TVA states that opportunities for fishing around the reservoir will be enormously increased.

In summary, the Tellico project is a sound project providing:

Flood control will be provided.

Power generation, in tandem, as it were, with Fort Loudoun Reservoir, will be increased.

Navigation benefits will follow.

New industrial sites will be made available.

Job opportunities and employment in an Appalachian area with chronic economic ills will be provided, and vast benefits from recreation will be opened.

This project is budgeted and certainly should not be deleted.

I believe this is the only instance in this important appropriation where an effort is being made to strike a budgeted item from the bill.

The amendment should be defeated.

I urge you to support the committee in this matter and vote down the pending amendment.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, although this dam is not in my district, it is part of the overall plan of the Tennessee Valley Authority and works into that complex and that great picture that the TVA has created in the whole Tennessee Valley.

TVA has often been referred to as the heartbeat of the valley, and I agree. This dam is feasible, and should be built. I am in opposition to the amendment, and urge that it be defeated, and that the whole measure be adopted by the House with the budget of the Tennessee Valley Authority included, which also includes a flood control project in my district.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

If this amendment prevails, justification for doing so would be equal justification for voting down every item in the bill, every budgeted item that is presented in the bill. I hope that these projects that have been presented here, fine and valuable projects, will remain intact, and we will accept the committee's version of the bill.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, as many Members have reiterated today, it is incumbent upon us this year to cut out or cut the costs of all defensible Federal programs and projects, in order that we will be able to continue adequately, and in some cases to increase, truly essential

programs. Several amendments were proposed today to the public works portion of the appropriations bill before us, which would have reduced the cost of the bill without, in my opinion, being detrimental to this Nation. I am disappointed that none of these were adopted.

I am sure that the members of the Appropriations Committee, who handled this bill, and of the Public Works Committee, who handled the predecessor authorization bill, took their duties seriously and have offered what they consider a good compromise. But I personally feel that a lesser cost compromise would have been preferable.

A principal reason why none of the amendments were adopted of course is patently clear. A number of individual Members here today who have told me they would like to vote against specific projects, also told me a fact we all know, that they as individuals are not desirous of having the sponsors of these specific projects discover their disaffection, for they fear that possible future projects in their own district, even though of potentially much greater merit, might suffer. And as all of us have observed, at no time have standing or teller votes been asked on any one of the amendments—a situation which is rare on a bill of this magnitude.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude that the best course I can follow to express my dissatisfaction with the cost of this bill, and my disappointment with the situation which prevails on the floor, is to vote against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill be passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17787) making appropriation for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, has directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DAVIS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that Committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 35, after line 5, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 511. Each appropriation item contained in this Act shall be reduced by five per centum which shall be applied uniformly to each item, project, and activity funded under each appropriation item."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the nays appeared to have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 354, nays 25, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

YEAS—354

Abbutt	Brooks	Daddario
Abernethy	Brown, Calif.	Dague
Adair	Brown, Clarendon J., Jr.	Daniels
Addabbo	Broyhill, Va.	Dawson
Anderson, Ill.	Buchanan	de la Garza
Anderson, Tenn.	Burke	De lae
Andrews	Burleson	Dent
George W.	Burton, Calif.	Denton
Andrews	Burton, Utah	Derwinski
Glenn	Byrne, Pa.	Devine
Andrews	Cabell	Dickinson
N. Dak.	Cahill	Diggs
Annuzio	Callan	Dingell
Arends	Callaway	Dole
Ashbrook	Carey	Donohue
Ashley	Casey	Dow
Ashmore	Cederberg	Dowdy
Ayres	Celler	Downing
Bandstra	Chamberlain	Dulski
Baring	Chelf	Duncan, Oreg.
Barrett	Clancy	Duncan, Tenn.
Bates	Clark	Dwyer
Battin	Clausen	Edmondson
Beckworth	Don H.	Edwards, Ala.
Bell	Clawson, Del.	Edwards, Calif.
Bennett	Clewenger	Edwards, La.
Berry	Cohelan	Everett
Betts	Colmer	Evins, Tenn.
Bingham	Conable	Fallon
Blatnik	Conyers	Farnsley
Boggs	Cooley	Farnum
Boland	Corbett	Fascell
Bolton	Craley	Feighan
Bow	Cramer	Findley
Brademas	Culver	Fino
Bray	Cunningham	Flood
Brook	Curtin	Flynt
		Fogarty

Foley	Lennon	Rodino
Ford	Lipscomb	Rogers, Colo.
William D.	Long, La.	Rogers, Fla.
Fountain	Long, Md.	Ronan
Frelinghuysen	Love	Rooney, N.Y.
Friedel	McCarthy	Rooney, Pa.
Fulton, Pa.	McClary	Rosenthal
Fulton, Tenn.	McCulloch	Rostenkowski
Fuqua	McDowell	Roudebush
Gallagher	McFall	Roush
Garmatz	McGrath	Ryan
Gathings	McVicker	Satterfield
Gettys	Macdonald	St. Onge
Gibbons	Machen	Scheuer
Gilbert	Mackie	Schisler
Gilligan	Madden	Schmidhauser
Gonzalez	Mahon	Schneebell
Grabowski	Mailliard	Schweiker
Green, Oreg.	Marsh	Scott
Green, Pa.	Martin, Nebr.	Secrest
Greigg	Mathias	Selden
Grider	Matsunaga	Shipley
Griffiths	Matthews	Shriver
Gross	May	Sickles
Gubser	Meeds	Sikes
Gurney	Michel	Sisk
Hagen, Calif.	Mills	Skubitz
Haley	Minish	Slack
Hall	Mink	Smith, Calif.
Halleck	Minshall	Smith, Iowa
Halpern	Mize	Smith, N.Y.
Hamilton	Monagan	Springer
Hanley	Moore	Staggers
Hansen, Idaho	Moorhead	Staibbaum
Hansen, Iowa	Morgan	Stanton
Hansen, Wash.	Morris	Steed
Hardy	Morton	Stephens
Harsha	Mosher	Stubblefield
Harvey, Ind.	Moss	Sullivan
Harvey, Mich.	Multer	Sweeney
Hathaway	Murphy, Ill.	Talcott
Hawkins	Murphy, N.Y.	Taylor
Hébert	Natcher	Teague, Calif.
Hechler	Nedzi	Teague, Tex.
Helstoski	Nelsen	Tenzer
Henderson	Nix	Thomas
Herlong	O'Brien	Thompson, N.J.
Hicks	O'Hara, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Hollifield	Olsen, Mont.	Thomson, Wis.
Holland	Olson, Minn.	Todd
Horton	O'Neal, Ga.	Trimble
Hosmer	O'Neill, Mass.	Tuck
Howard	Passman	Tunney
Hull	Patman	Tupper
Huot	Patten	Tuten
Hutchinson	Pelly	Udall
Ichord	Pepper	Ullman
Irwin	Perkins	Utt
Jarman	Philbin	Van Deerlin
Jennings	Pickle	Vanik
Johnson, Calif.	Pike	Vigorito
Johnson, Okla.	Pirnie	Waggonner
Johnson, Pa.	Poage	Waldie
Jones, Ala.	Poff	Walker, N. Mex.
Jones, Mo.	Powell	Watkins
Karsten	Price	Watson
Karth	Pucinski	Weltner
Kastenmeier	Purcell	Whalley
Kee	Quile	White, Idaho
Keith	Quillen	White, Tex.
Kelly	Race	Whitener
Keogh	Randall	Whitten
King, Calif.	Redlin	Widnall
King, Utah	Rees	Williams
Kirwan	Reifel	Wilson
Kornegay	Resnick	Charles H.
Krebs	Reuss	Wolf
Landrum	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wright
Langen	Rhodes, Pa.	Wyatt
Latta	Rivers, Alaska	Yates
Leggett	Rivers, S.C.	Young
	Roberts	Younger
	Robison	Zablocki

NAYS—25

Broomfield	Fraser	Ottinger
Broyhill, N.C.	Goodell	Reid, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.	Grover	Reid, N.Y.
Cleveland	Joelson	Saylor
Collier	Jonas	Stafford
Curtis	Kupferman	Vivian
Davis, Wis.	Laird	Wydler
Erlenborn	MacGregor	
Ford, Gerald R.	Morse	

NOT VOTING—53

Adams	Corman	Gray
Albert	Davis, Ga.	Hagan, Ga.
Aspinall	Dorn	Hanna
Belcher	Dyal	Hays
Bolling	Ellsworth	Hungate
Cameron	Evans, Colo.	Jacobs
Carter	Farbstein	King, N.Y.
Conte	Fisher	Kluczynski

Kunkel	Murray	Senner
McDade	O'Hara, Mich.	Smith, Va.
McEwen	O'Konski	Stratton
McMillan	Pool	Toll
Mackay	Reinecke	Walker, Miss.
Martin, Ala.	Rogers, Tex.	Watts
Martin, Mass.	Roncalio	Willis
Miller	Roybal	Wilson, Bob
Moeller	Rumsfeld	
Morrison	St Germain	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Farbstain with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Albert with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Miller with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Dyal with Reinecke.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Rumsfeld.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Willis with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Rogers of Texas.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Cameron.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Mackay with Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. Moeller with Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Murray.

Mr. TUCK changed his vote from "nay" to "yea".

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE LOWER TETON DAM IN FREMONT COUNTY, IDAHO

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the Lower Teton Dam in Fremont County, Idaho, was authorized several years ago and construction is urgently needed to provide supplemental water to the farmers in that area and to control the serious flooding and drought condition. However, the President in his budget for fiscal 1967 did not recommend

the appropriation of funds to begin construction of this project.

In April, I appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations, urging that at least \$50,000 be approved to begin preliminary construction investigation to permit the project to get underway. I regret that funds were not recommended. Knowing of the opposition of the House to additional increases in the budget, I have not pressed the issue in debate today.

However, because of the urgent need for this project, the Senate may follow the action taken last year and authorize money to permit work to commence this next year and avoid the delay of a full year or more on this essential development. Should this occur, I respectfully urge the conferees to accept a position which would permit this very necessary project to move ahead.

As a matter of further interest to the House and the information of the conferees, I am including in the RECORD a copy of my statement before the committee.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE V. HANSEN, SECOND DISTRICT, IDAHO, BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE, APRIL 25, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of again appearing before this Committee to request funds for a start on the Lower Teton Dam, Fremont County, Idaho. I would like to make just a very brief statement today and then, if it is permissible, to include as a part of that statement the statement I made before this Committee last year—a copy of which has been furnished to the Committee Members. The facts have not changed—the situation has not changed—except that another year has gone by with no concrete prospects of relief for those in the area who are hit by recurrent flood and drought cycles. The statement brings out these salient facts—

The Fremont Dam is a multi-purpose development designed to make maximum use of available water resources in the area. It is a two-stage project. The first stage, for which we are asking appropriations now, would bring no new land under irrigation. It would, however, provide urgently-needed supplemental water for 114,000 acres. The project would also provide substantial flood protection to a highly developed area in the Upper Snake River Basin which has suffered severe damage from floods in recent years.

Flood and drought conditions in the same year in this area are not uncommon. The seriousness of an alternate flood and drought cycle was vividly illustrated in 1961 and 1962. During the summer of 1961, Fremont and Madison Counties were declared drought emergency areas. In February, 1962, extremely high runoff caused record floods in Henry's Fork and Teton River Valleys and the Snake River Plain. Thus, within six months, the same area was declared a drought area and a flood disaster area.

May I point out to the Members of this Committee that, in 1964, Idaho was honored when the Chairman, the Gentleman from Ohio, and the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, personally inspected this area. At that time both acclaimed the project and the Secretary stated that plans for the project "likely will be pressed in this fiscal year beginning July 1 so that initial work can begin in 1966". Fiscal 1966, of course, has passed us by with no funds for beginning the project.

Secretary Udall has reaffirmed his support of the urgency and need for the project in a letter I have received from Robert W. Nelson, Deputy Assistant Secretary, which

states: "In reply to your telegram of April 20, the need for Fremont Dam and Reservoir to provide flood control and supplemental irrigation water remains unchanged from that defined in our report on the Lower Teton Division, Teton Basin Project, Idaho, which was printed as House Document No. 208, 88th Congress."

In that document there is a letter, signed by Darlington W. Denit, Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, which was approved and adopted by Secretary Udall. It states, in part, "I conclude, therefore, that the plans of development outlined in this report for both the initial stage and for the ultimate stage of the lower Teton division are feasible and economically justified, that there now exists an urgent need for supplemental water supplies to presently irrigated lands and for flood protection, and that power and recreation benefits can be realized by construction of the initial stage, lower Teton division, Teton Basin project." (Italic added.)

Additionally, the Lower Teton Dam enjoys complete and unanimous bi-partisan support by all individuals and groups concerned and Joint Memorials to the Congress urging its funding have been passed unanimously by both houses of the Idaho State Legislature.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, the Senate approved an appropriation of \$300,000 for this project, the amount Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, had said would be used the first year. However, Mr. Dominy informed me that as little as \$50,000 could be used initially in contract negotiations to save up to a year's valuable time in the ultimate completion of this vital project.

I realize that the amount of money available under the budget for 1967 is limited, and that there are many calls upon it. However, I believe a compromise might be made—through approving appropriation of the above-mentioned \$50,000—which would have a relatively minute effect on the budget, and which would allow time-consuming negotiations on contracts to get underway immediately.

Mr. Chairman, that ends my formal statement. If the Chairman or the Committee Members have questions, I shall be happy to answer them.

CHILD NUTRITION

Mr. COOLEY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3467) to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children.

MILITARY MEDICAL BENEFITS AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 14088) to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes.

RESERVE FORCES BILL OF RIGHTS AND VITALIZATION ACT OF 1966, AND NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS BENEFITS ACT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules and on be-

half of my colleague from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] I call up House Resolution 1009 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 1009

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17195) to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the reserve components of the armed forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 297]

Abernethy	Evins, Tenn.	Moeller
Adams	Fallon	Morrison
Addabbo	Farbstein	Morse
Albert	Fisher	Murray
Anderson,	Flood	O'Hara, Mich.
Tenn.	Fogarty	O'Konski
Andrews,	Foley	Pelly
Glenn	Garmatz	Pool
Aspinall	Giaino	Powell
Baring	Gilbert	Purcell
Barrett	Gray	Rees
Battin	Hagan, Ga.	Reinecke
Belcher	Hanna	Rogers, Tex.
Boggs	Hansen, Wash.	Roncallo
Bolling	Harvey, Ind.	Rooney, Pa.
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Roybal
Callan	Herlong	Rumsfeld
Callaway	Hollifield	St Germain
Cameron	Hungate	Senner
Carter	Jacobs	Slack
Celler	King, N.Y.	Smith, Va.
Clark	Kirwan	Steed
Conte	Kluczynski	Stratton
Corman	Krebs	Thompson, Tex.
Craley	Kunkel	Toll
Davis, Ga.	Lipscomb	Tunney
Denton	McDade	Tupper
Dickinson	McEwen	Ullman
Duncan, Oreg.	McMillan	Walker, Miss.
Dyal	Mackay	Watts
Edwards, Calif.	Martin, Ala.	Whitener
Ellsworth	Martin, Mass.	Willis
Evans, Colo.	Miller	Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 330 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RESERVE FORCES BILL OF RIGHTS AND VITALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1009 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 17195, a bill to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes.

H.R. 17195 is designed to correct deficiencies and substitute certainty for uncertainty in the Reserve program.

Title I of the bill would substantially revise the composition and administration of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces. It has as its primary objective the establishment by statute of a Reserve component organizational structure that will enable these components to more fully and effectively meet their mobilization readiness requirements as established in the contingency and war plans approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As a collateral objective, this legislation would eliminate the present uncertainty and instability of the existing Reserve structure by establishing its minimum size and composition in permanent law.

The provisions of title II of the bill will clarify the employee status of National Guard technicians by making them Federal employees and thus eligible for the various Federal employee benefits that will flow from this status.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1009 in order that H.R. 17195 may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES ACT

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I know that it is late, and everyone is in a hurry to get home, and we have to have a rollcall. I shall be very brief. But I think this will be the only opportunity I shall have between now and Monday to address the House in regard to the discharge petition of H.R. 15111, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1966, or the war-on-poverty bill.

If this bill is called up on next Monday, September 26, pursuant to the 21-day rule—House Resolution 1014—it is my present intention to raise a point of

order against the consideration of House Resolution 1014. The facts are as follows:

First. The bill was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor on June 1.

Second. On June 3 the Rules Committee received a letter from the chairman of Education and Labor requesting a hearing "at the earliest possible date in order that we may seek action on the floor of the House without delay."

Third. Hearings were promptly held on the following dates: June 9, 14, 15, 21, 22 and 23. Hearings were also set on June 27 and 29 in order to give the chairman an opportunity to appear. He did not appear at any time before the Rules Committee.

Fourth. On June 29 the Rules Committee reported an open rule with 8 hours of debate to consider H.R. 15111 making it possible for the Speaker to recognize another majority member to call up the bill if the chairman were not available. This is House Resolution 923 accompanied by Rules Committee Report No. 1707.

Fifth. Due to the July 4 recess the rule was not filed until July 14.

Sixth. On September 1, more than 1½ months after a rule had been granted, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee filed House Resolution 1014 under the 21-day rule. It was defective and a corrected version was filed September 2.

House rules provide for the use of the 21-day rule when the Rules Committee has acted adversely or not acted within 21 days. This was not the situation in this instance. The Rules Committee acted affirmatively. I do not believe that the 21-day rule was ever intended to be used in this way.

Mr. Speaker, now as to the bill H.R. 17195, this bill is a result of extensive and comprehensive hearings held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services for more than a year. The hearings established the need for a revision in the organizational and administrative structure of the Reserve components so as to enable each of these Reserve components to more fully and effectively meet their mobilization readiness requirements as dictated by our contingency and war plans.

As a collateral requirement, this legislation is designed to eliminate any questions as to the future of the Army Reserve components and will preclude the Department of Defense from destroying the Army Reserve. This legislation is therefore also designed to eliminate the uncertainty in the Army Reserve program.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill as reported by the Committee on Armed Services contains two titles: Title I is concerned with changes in the administrative and organizational structure of the Reserve forces and title II is concerned with resolving the employment status of National Guard technicians.

TITLE I. RESERVE FORCES

The major objective of title I would be accomplished by first, the establishment of the position of an Assistant Secretary

of Defense for Reserve Affairs whose responsibility will be exclusively the management and administration of the Reserve Forces structure; second, the requirement by statute that organized units of the drilling Reserve be provided the level of equipment necessary to properly conduct their training functions and also that the additional equipment necessary to meet their mobilization requirements be also maintained in inventory; and third, the establishment of a mandated floor on the strength on drilling units in the Reserve components so as to insure the availability of sufficient manpower to satisfy immediate mobilization requirements.

TITLE II. NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS

Title II of the bill, very simply stated, will establish a Federal employee status for technicians employed by the National Guard.

At the present time there are 39,533 technicians employed by the National Guard—22,969 by the Army National Guard, and 16,564 by the Air National Guard.

These technicians today, although paid by the Federal Government, are not considered Federal employees, and consequently are not eligible for Federal retirement, health, and insurance benefits. This title will change this situation and provide them with an essential Federal employee status, and therefore make them eligible for these benefits.

COSTS OF THE BILL

The increased annual cost which will result from enactment of this legislation is approximately \$25 million.

Twelve million dollars of this increased annual cost is attributable to the provisions of title I equalizing the per diem payments to Regular and Reserve personnel.

The provisions of title II will result in an increased annual cost of \$13 million which represents the cost resulting from employer contributions by the Federal Government for retirement, health, and insurance benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with the statements of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] on the present bill. I urge adoption of the rule. I have no further requests for time and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the present resolution be corrected on page 2, line 10, by striking out all after the word "Whole" on line 10 and all on line 11 down to the word "Whole".

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17195) to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States

Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17195), with Mr. FASCELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, first of all, please accept my apologies and the apologies of the members of the Armed Services Committee for retaining you at this late hour, but it becomes necessary because of conditions beyond our control. It is necessary that we have this legislation passed in order that the other body might act on the appropriation bill which was the subject of discussion here some weeks ago. For that reason, we are compelled to press the issue at this moment. I assure you that every member of the Armed Services Committee, including our distinguished chairman, understands the exact feeling you have and appreciates your cooperation. We appreciate it very deeply.

I shall not use up any more of the time than is quite necessary, and it will be just a few minutes, in order that we might get to a vote on this bill.

Recalling and refreshing the memory of the Members as to the situation which brings the bill to the floor at this moment, for over several years the Committee on Armed Services has studied the Reserve problem. This bill is the result of that study. In essence, this bill protects the integrity of the Guard and the Army Reserves and carries into effect that act which the Defense Department has declared it wanted over a period of many months, but compels the words of promise to be translated into action. That is simply what it does.

Title II of the bill, known as the Guard technician bill, transfers members of the National Guard in the maintenance and technician area to the Federal Civil Service. The Members are all familiar with this. We have heard from our Governors and adjutants general, so we are familiar with that.

There is one new feature of the bill, which is important. We come to you under your direction and your mandate. This is the instruction and the authority

of the President to call up a certain number of reservists without a declaration of a national emergency. This language will allow the President to call up, if he so desires, some 133,000 individual reservists who have not been trained for the minimum of 4 months and are attached to units. In addition, there will be some 60,000 individuals who have trained but are not attached to units who might be called. In other words, this would limit the call to the 190,000, give or take a few thousand, by the President, after he decides to call up these people.

That is a simple and quick explanation I can give on the bill. I am sure all Members are familiar with it.

Mr. Chairman, enactment of H.R. 17195 is, in my opinion, absolutely essential if we are to provide our Nation with a Reserve Component structure that will insure our national security.

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Armed Services has studied the Reserve program for more than 5 years. The studies included extensive hearings following the Berlin crisis in 1962 and another most comprehensive set of hearings in 1965 at the time Secretary of Defense McNamara outlined his most recent plan for reorganizing the Reserve program. These hearings, which are available as a public document, establishes beyond any doubt the absolute necessity for a drastic revision in the administrative organization of the Reserve program and the statutory basis for our Reserve Component organizations.

For more years than I care to remember, the Reserve Components of each of the armed services have had a turbulent and chaotic history.

Our Reserve Forces have been saluted and eulogized by the executive branch for their "indispensable contributions to our national security," and yet at the same time damned by inattention, neglect, and lack of effective leadership.

Let me give you a little history:

In 1954, the Department of Defense recommended legislation which would have tremendously increased the strength of our Reserve Forces. At that time, the proponents, from the executive branch, for this change in our Reserve Forces structure pointed out that this increased strength was absolutely essential to our national security.

The Congress endorsed most of this program and it was enacted into law as the "Reserve Forces Act of 1955."

Only a few years later, in February 1958, the Congress was advised by the executive branch that our Reserve structure, particularly the Army Reserve component structure, required a drastic overhaul, including a marked reduction in personnel strengths. Both Secretary of the Army Brucker and the then Chief of Staff of the Army, General Maxwell Taylor, advised the Congress and this committee that, and I quote them:

This reshaping of the structure of both Reserve components is necessary to make them responsive to the needs of the Army of today and of the foreseeable future.

At that time, Army witnesses stated, and I now quote them, that—

These revisions in mobilization plans clearly indicate the need for a change in our Reserve component structure which will more adequately support our current strategic plans, maintain and support Reserve forces in a condition of high readiness, and meet mobilization requirements.

Significantly enough, the Army witness also stated that—and I again quote the Army witness:

The structure I have presented is designed to give the Army the balanced force it needs to perform its missions. The Reserve components cannot maintain a stable program if units are added and deleted with increasing frequency. Rather, the number of units in the troop basis should change only when there is a major change in the requirements for forces.

The reorganization proposed in 1958 was the pentomic reorganization and was placed into effect with assurances that this new structure would surely result in a high condition of readiness for the Army Reserve components.

Following the pentomic restructure of the Army Reserve components, we were suddenly told in 1962 that the Army Reserve components again were out of step with our strategic war plans and required additional reorganization. Again, the Congress was told that the reorganization was necessary to insure that these Reserve units would be "operationally ready" and responsive to deployment schedules and contingency and war plans.

The year, again, I repeat, was 1962. Significantly, this reorganization also involved a planned reduction in personnel strengths.

Concurrently with this advice to the Congress, the Armed Services Committee conducted a review of the responsiveness of the Army Reserve component units that were called to active duty during the Berlin crisis. Regrettably, the committee found that many of these units required more than 6 months to achieve a level of readiness that would have permitted their operational deployment.

It was therefore evident that the previous reorganizations of the Army Reserve components in 1955 and 1958 had not, despite their laudable objectives, satisfied the requirement for increased readiness.

Consequently, the committee was impressed by the case presented by Secretary of the Army Stephen Ailes in 1962 for another reorganization of the Reserve components. At that time, Secretary Ailes stated the Department's objectives as follows:

The readiness results which these measures achieve are dramatic. As the force structure shows, we will have six division forces ready to go in 8 weeks. A full complement of needed, up-to-date units to round out the Active Army is ready in 4 to 8 weeks. We will have no less than 11 high-priority brigades, 2 ready in 5 weeks, and the remaining 9 ready in 8 weeks. These versatile brigades, organized on the ROAD basis, are available for a series of specific area missions but are also of great value as corps troops, for rear area security and the like. Finally, and in addition to the above, we will still have an adequate base for general mobilization.

Despite these vitally important departmental objectives, the committee had

very serious reservations concerning the effectiveness of the reorganization plan since, in the committee's opinion, the plan did not include any genuinely effective measures to satisfy the demonstrated critical requirements for both trained personnel and equipment. However, after much soul searching, and assurances from the Department that these critical requirements would be satisfied, the committee, on December 3, 1962, advised the Secretary of the Army that "it would have no objection to implementation of the new plan realigning the Reserve components."

For the third time this committee followed the advice of the executive department in the third reorganization of the Reserve Forces.

The smoke and trauma of this last drastic reorganization of the Reserve components had not been completely dissipated when Secretary of Defense McNamara, late in 1964, announced the Department's intention to again completely reorganize the Army Reserve components. This new reorganization plan, not surprisingly, recommended another personnel reduction and justified the proposed action for the very same reasons previously advanced by the Army in each of the earlier reorganizations.

The Congress balked at this last proposal of the Department and simply refused to provide the Department with the necessary statutory authority which would have permitted this reorganization to occur. In addition, the Congress emphasized its opposition to the merger proposal by mandating the required level of personnel strengths for both the Army Reserve and Army National Guard.

It is interesting to note that in 1962 the objective, hidden as it might have been, was to destroy the National Guard. Failing to destroy the National Guard, the objective in the 1964 proposition, the merger, was to destroy the Reserves—in other words, use any weapon at hand to accomplish your objective.

Despite this unequivocal and clear rejection of the merger proposal by the Congress, the Pentagon, for reasons that are not clear to me, continues to persist in predicating all its future planning on this abortive merger and reorganization proposal.

The result of this unexplainable Pentagon determination to thwart the will of Congress has been the creation of further chaos and instability in the Army Reserve component structure.

Today, except for the Selected Reserve Force of approximately 155,000 personnel, the rest of the Army Reserve components have achieved a new low in operational readiness—matched only by the level of their morale, which is even lower.

Congress, and this committee in particular, will not permit this situation to continue. It is obvious that legislation is required to provide an environment in which our Reserve component forces have a fighting chance of reaching their required level of operational readiness.

The Pentagon has been attempting to sell to the American public the idea that a structural reorganization of the Army

Reserve components will achieve greater economies and tremendous increases in operational readiness. Historically we have noted that these changes have, for practical purposes, resulted in nothing more significant than a bookkeeping entry, save perhaps a further reduction in operational readiness.

As stated in the subcommittee report in 1962 on Reserve posture, the critical requirements for the Reserve program are trained personnel, equipment and effective leadership. It is evident that the Pentagon's repeated plans have failed to satisfy any of these important requirements despite the fact that they have continued to assure the Congress that these would result.

The committee therefore has incorporated in title I of this bill, language which would require the Secretaries concerned, as well as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs, to insure that both the personnel and equipment requirements of units established in the Ready Reserve be fully satisfied.

It is difficult for me to comprehend why the Department would choose to oppose this type of statutory requirement since it is one which they have given lip service to for the past 10 years.

Also included in this bill, as title II, is language recommended by the Department of Defense which would provide National Guard technicians with a Federal employee status. This element of the bill appears not to be controversial particularly since it is endorsed by the Department of Defense.

I will now endeavor to provide the House with a comprehensive summary of the principal features of this legislation.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

TITLE I—RESERVE FORCES

Title I of the bill would, if enacted, substantially revise the composition and administration of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces. It has as its primary objective the establishment by statute of a Reserve component organizational structure that will enable these components to more fully and effectively meet their mobilization readiness requirements as established in the contingency and war plans approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As a collateral objective, this legislation would eliminate the present uncertainty and instability of the existing Reserve structure by establishing its minimum size and composition in permanent law.

Briefly, title I would accomplish these objectives by the following:

First, revising both the civilian and military administrative organization of the Reserve components:

The civilian administrative reorganization would establish the position of an "Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs" and an "Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs" in each of the armed services. Unlike the present situation the civilian executives responsible for the Reserve program will be given appropriate statutory recognition and stature commensurate with their overall responsibility for the personnel, material, and operational readiness of their respective Reserve components.

The military administrative reorganization would:

Create by statute the positions of "Chief, Army Reserve" and "Chief, Air Force Reserve" comparable to that presently provided for "Chief of the National Guard."

Revise the composition of the Department of Defense Reserve Forces Policy Board to include the new Secretaries for Manpower and Reserve Affairs; making the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs its permanent chairman; adding three civilian members representative of labor, education and industry and requiring that this Department of Defense Reserve Forces Policy Board meet at least once each quarter.

Revise the composition and functioning of the Reserve Forces Policy Board of the Army and Air Force to insure that the considered views and recommendations of these boards will accompany any proposed changes in regulations or policy affecting the Reserve components before they are acted upon by the Chief of Staff or the Assistant Secretary for Reserve Affairs of the service concerned.

Second. Clarifying the composition of the Ready Reserve structure by:

Creating a Selected Reserve Force within the Ready Reserve of each of the Reserve components. This force would consist entirely of individuals attached to drilling units of the Ready Reserve in a pay status. Today all Ready Reservists whether in a drill status, in a nonpay status, or in an inactive status are all lumped together purely on the basis of "liability" for call to duty.

Requiring that the personnel strength of the Selected Reserve Forces in each of the Reserve components be maintained at not less than a specified numerical strength:

Personnel strengths

Component	Selected Reserve proposed strength, H.R. 17195	Active mobilization requirements ¹	DOD, manning authority for fiscal year 1967 ²
Army Reserve	260,000		
Army National Guard	380,000	688,200	681,400
Air Reserve	51,000	91,665	58,311
Air National Guard	80,000	99,275	80,901
Naval Reserve	126,000	170,000	135,100
Marine Reserve	48,000	69,891	51,000
Coast Guard Reserve	17,000	33,267	16,750
Total	962,000	1,152,398	1,042,462

¹ Includes 100 percent strength for approved DOD forces plus individual mobilization designees.

² Individuals authorized paid training in both the unit and individual program in fiscal year 1967 budget.

Authorizing the Secretary concerned to establish, reorganize, or deactivate units in the Selected Reserve force as may be necessary to conform to changing requirements in contingency and war plans of the Department as approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense.

Third. Charging the Secretary concerned with the statutory responsibility to provide the personnel, equipment, facilities, and other logistic support necessary to enable units and Reserves in the Selected Reserve under his jurisdiction to meet the mobilization readiness requirements prescribed for them by the Joint

Chiefs of Staff in the contingency and war plans. In connection with this responsibility, the Secretary would also be required by law to support units established in the Selected Reserve by procuring, issuing, and maintaining supplies and equipment of combat grade quality needed for their training; and furthermore, to store and maintain such additional supplies and equipment of the same quality as would be required for mobilization. This new provision in the law would also prohibit the expenditure of Reserve appropriations for any purpose other than those for which the funds were originally appropriated.

Fourth. Adding miscellaneous provisions which would:

Establish the statutory requirements that all new enlistees in the Reserve enlistment program—REP—be required to commence their prescribed period of active duty for training of 4 months or more within 180 days after such enlistment.

Provide that individuals enlisted in the REP program prior to July 1, 1966, who had not completed an initial period of active duty for training of 4 months or more may, under regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense, be considered to have completed such training if certain prescribed minimum periods of annual active duty for training and drill attendance had been satisfactorily completed.

Provide the President with authority to order to active duty involuntarily certain members of the Ready Reserve. This provision is explained in detail as a committee amendment to the bill.

Provide authority to permit the Departments to utilize unit vacancy promotion authority to fill essential billets in Reserve units.

Eliminate existing inequities in the payment of per diem between Regulars and Reserves.

Authorize establishment of National Guard units in the Virgin Islands.

Permit the enlistment of women officers in the National Guard.

COSTS OF TITLE I

Enactment of the provisions of title I of this bill should not require any increase in Department of Defense expenditures since the language of title I simply requires, by statute, the same logistic and equipment support for units in the Reserve component structure that has been recommended to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The mandated personnel strengths will not result in any increased cost during fiscal year 1967 over and above those already funded by the Congress in the DOD Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1967 since the mandated strength levels contained in the bill will not become effective until July 1, 1967. Also, as previously mentioned, these strength levels are the same as those contained in the Appropriation Act.

Additional costs will result from enactment of title I in respect to the language which provides the same entitlement to Reserve personnel as is presently provided Regular military personnel in the matter of per diem eligibility

when the circumstances are essentially the same.

The Department advises that based on the projected strength of the Reserve components—National Guard strength is included since members thereof are normally also members of a Reserve component—and computed on amounts currently authorized in the joint travel regulations for members of active duty, the enactment of the bill would result in an increase in the annual budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense as follows:

[In thousands]

Army Reserve	\$2,941
Army National Guard	2,817
Naval Reserve	3,876
Marine Corps Reserve	345
Air Force Reserve	1,141
Air National Guard	836
Total	11,956

The Department advises that no funds for this purpose have been included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1967. However, the Department recommends enactment of this authority.

TITLE II—NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS

Title II of the bill is concerned with providing a Federal employee status for technicians employed by the National Guard.

At the present time there are 39,533 technicians employed by the National Guard—22,969 by the Army National Guard, and 16,564 by the Air National Guard. All of these technicians are distributed throughout the States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. Unfortunately, the technician today occupies a position without legal parallel. His salary is paid by the Federal Government, yet he is employed by the State Guard. As a consequence of this unique situation, he has not been adequately provided for by either the State or the Federal Government. The technician today faces all the job hazards confronting a civilian employee of the Government or private industry. However, in addition the technician is confronted with the hazard of losing his National Guard membership by virtue of ill health or the attritive provision of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act. With the loss of his National Guard membership, he then automatically loses his employment as a National Guard technician. Consequently, the lack of an adequate retirement and employee benefits program for National Guard technicians is particularly inequitable and detrimental to the desire of the National Guard to maintain an adequate force of capable and efficient career employees.

The Congress, and the Committee on Armed Services, has emphasized the vital necessity of technicians maintaining a dual status, i.e., both a civilian and military status with their National Guard organization. The committee's purpose in this desire is to insure that at such time as the unit may be mobilized during a national emergency or a war, the technicians who provide the nucleus for these National Guard organizations will be included among those ordered to active duty.

The provisions of title II of H.R. 17195 will clarify the employee status of National Guard technicians by making them Federal employees and this eligible for the various Federal employee benefits that will flow from this status.

The bill as reported by the Committee on Armed Services is identical with a legislative draft proposal prepared by the Department of Defense and concurred in by the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President's Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems.

The principal features of title II of the bill are as follows:

First. All National Guard technicians would become Federal employees.

Second. The adjutant general of each State may be designated to employ technicians and administer the program, in accordance with joint Army-Air Force regulations to be approved by the Secretary of Defense.

Third. The Secretaries of the Army and Air Force would continue to designate the positions and appropriate military grades for those requiring National Guard membership as a continuing condition of employment. These would be outside the competitive civil service. All other positions; for example, those for which females are eligible, would be within the competitive civil service.

Fourth. All technicians in States which do not cover them under their State retirement programs, and all technicians employed after the effective date of the legislation, would be covered under the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act. Those who are covered by a State retirement program on the effective date, to the extent permitted by State law, would be permitted to elect to remain covered by the local program. If they do not so elect, they, too, would be covered by the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act.

Fifth. All technicians, including those who remained covered by State retirement programs, would be eligible for Federal group life and health benefits insurance.

Sixth. All active Federal military service would be credited to those who would become covered by the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act, except for technicians entitled to retired pay by reason of 20 or more years' active military duty—title II retirement. All technicians under the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act would also receive credit for any prior Federal civil service employment and all prior technician service. No deposit would be required to cover the period of military service. No deposit would be required for prior technician service, but if the technician does not make the deposit—6 percent of his salary from July 1, 1948–October 31, 1956, 6½ percent of his salary thereafter—his annuity would be reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the unpaid deposits.

Seventh. Under the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act, a person may retire voluntarily at age 62 with 5 years' service, at age 60 with 20 years' service, or age 55 with 30 years' service. If separated involuntarily, he is entitled to an

immediate annuity at age 50 with 20 years' service, or with 25 years at any age. If separated involuntarily, after 5 years of service, lacking eligibility for an immediate annuity, he is entitled to severance pay based upon his years of service and age. The recently enacted Federal pay bill permits voluntary retirement at age 55 with 30 years of service, or at age 60 with 20 years, in both cases with a full annuity. Those involuntarily separated would incur no reduction in annuity for age, except for those below 55. The reduction rate is one-sixth percent per month thereafter for each month of the member's age below 55.

Eighth. The Federal Civil Service Retirement Act annuity would be in addition to "title III retirement," social security, and any annuity to which the technician might be entitled by reason of participation in a State retirement program. A technician retired under "title II" after 20 years of active duty, although he could not count his military service for Federal civil service retirement, would be entitled to credit his prior and future technician service toward a Federal Civil Service Retirement Act annuity.

Ninth. Positions would be converted to the Federal GS—general schedule—and WB—wage board—system. All technicians would receive the same or greater compensation under the conversion. The incumbent of a position which is downgraded would retain his salary rate until he vacates the position. Sick leave, annual leave, military leave, step level, and time-in-grade step increases which had been earned would be carried over.

Tenth. Overtime would be payable at the same rates as for other Federal employees. Special authority would be provided for payment of premium pay on an annual basis, in lieu of overtime, to those "wage board" technicians assigned operational duties at air defense sites.

Eleventh. Future and past service of those technicians who would become covered by the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act, would be creditable in other Federal employment covered by that act. For example, a technician separated in 1955 and now or hereafter employed by the Federal Government in a position covered by the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act would be entitled to credit for his technician service before 1955.

Twelfth. Certain other Federal legislation would automatically become applicable. For example, the Federal Tort Claims Act would apply in the event of an "in scope" act or omission of a technician which results in death, injury, or property damage to third persons. The Federal Employees Compensation Act—workmen's compensation—would continue to apply. It would be possible to utilize technicians as contracting officers to assist U.S. property and fiscal officers. Increases in salaries of those covered by the Classification Act and those in the wage board category would be automatic upon any increase in the compensation of other Federal employees in the same category.

Thirteenth. The legislation would be effective on the first day of the first pay period that begins on or after July 1, 1967.

COSTS OF TITLE II—H.R. 17195

Increased costs for retirement, group life, group health, and overtime, National Guard technicians

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971
I. Retirement:				
Army National Guard.....	2.0	1.9	1.7	1.8
Air National Guard.....	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.8
II. Group life insurance:				
Army National Guard.....	.5	.5	.5	.5
Air National Guard.....	.4	.4	.4	.4
III. Group health benefits:				
Army National Guard.....	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
Air National Guard.....	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
IV. Overtime:				
Army National Guard.....	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2
Air National Guard.....	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.1
Total all programs:				
Army National Guard.....	7.3	7.2	7.0	7.1
Air National Guard.....	5.6	5.7	5.4	5.5
Grand total.....	12.9	12.9	12.4	12.6

NOTE.—In addition to the future costs reflected above, the amount of increase in the unfunded liability of the civil service retirement fund, which will result from inclusion of National Guard technicians in the retirement program, is estimated to be \$577,000,000. (Reference: "Report of the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems.")

AMENDMENT

The bill as reported by the Committee on Armed Services includes three principal amendments. These amendments are as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENT

The committee made a number of substantive changes to H.R. 17195 and in addition numerous technical changes. As a consequence, and in the interest of simplicity, the committee directed that

the language be rewritten incorporating the various amendments approved by the committee.

The principal substantive amendments incorporated in the bill, as rewritten, are as follows:

First. The committee included in section 105 of the bill new language relating to the authority of the President to involuntarily recall to active duty certain members of the Ready Reserve. The

language of section 105, as amended, would in subsection (a), provide the President with permanent authority to call to extended active duty those members of the Ready Reserve who are not attached to an organized unit in the drilling Reserve and who have neither satisfied their Reserve military obligation nor have completed a total of 24 months of active duty or active duty for training.

Simply stated, this would give the President, after notifying Congress, authority to order to active duty nondrilling reservists in the Reserve pool. It is estimated that at the present time there are approximately 64,000 individuals in this category, of which approximately 51,000 are in the Army Reserve.

Subsection (b) would give the President, after notifying Congress, temporary authority, until July 1, 1968, to order to active duty those members of the Ready Reserve attached to drilling units who had become such members prior to July 1, 1966, and who have not received their minimum training of 4 months or more in the Reserve enlistment program.

The cutoff date of July 1, 1966, is used since personnel enlisted in the Reserve enlistment program after that date would be required by statute—the provisions of clause 10 of H.R. 17195—to be sent to active duty for training within 180 days.

The language of this subsection would, therefore, permit the President to order approximately 133,000 individuals in the Reserve enlistment program to active duty.

This language differs significantly from the Senate amendment to the appropriation bill which was much broader in scope, and would have authorized the President to order to active duty an estimated 472,000 of the total 672,000 reservists and guardsmen who presently comprise the organized Army Reserve components program.

Subsection (c) stipulates the maximum period of service as being 24 months.

Subsection (d) provides that in ordering these personnel affected to active duty, appropriate consideration must be given to family responsibilities; and employment necessary to maintain the national health, safety, or interest.

Second. The committee amended the bill to conform the proposed "average annual strength" figures in H.R. 17195 to the strength figures approved by the Congress for fiscal year 1967 in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act.

The net result of this amendment is to reduce the number of personnel proposed for the receipt of drill pay from the 1,019,000 figure originally contained in the bill, to 962,000, a net reduction of 57,000 spaces. The new "average strength" figures recommended by the committee in H.R. 17195 would thus conform precisely to the "year end strength" figure funded by the Congress for the Reserve components.

Third. The committee amended the bill to provide that the mandated personnel strengths would not become effective until July 1, 1967. This change in the bill will enable the individual Re-

serve components to more effectively program and plan to achieve the "average annual strengths" established in the bill.

It is important to note that the mandated strength levels will become effective immediately after the strength levels mandated in the fiscal year 1967 Appropriation Act lapses. The Department of Defense fiscal year 1967 appropriation language does presently include a provision requiring the Army Reserve to "attain an average strength of not less than 260,000 for fiscal year 1967" and the Army National Guard "to attain an average strength of not less than 380,000 for fiscal year 1967."

The balance of the changes made by the committee were basically technical or minor in nature.

SUMMARY

These are the details of the legislation brought before you by the Committee on Armed Services. This bill represents a great deal of effort on the part of every member of the committee. It also represents the thinking and convictions of dozens of other Members of this body who have assisted the committee in its deliberations. I am certain that the House will give this bill the unanimous approval that it so richly deserves.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman has made a very succinct but comprehensive statement. I am in favor of this bill.

In view of the gentleman's statement about calling up these reservists who have not had training or those who have had inadequate training, most of whom are in the Army Reserve, will it not still be necessary, under the so-called Hall amendment, adopted in the committee, which is still in the bill, for the President first to notify the Congress before doing that?

Mr. HÉBERT. That is in the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. HALL. That is in the bill?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes, it was the gentleman himself who made the motion in the committee.

Mr. HALL. I just wanted to make it clear, in view of the recent statement that the President could call up this type of reservist.

Mr. HÉBERT. In accordance with the language of the legislation the President must certify to the Congress the necessity for using this authority.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for making that a part of the record.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. NEDZI. As the gentleman knows, I have been concerned about the mandated strengths in the Reserve bill. The gentleman has not addressed himself to that particular provision of the bill. I wonder if the gentleman, who is my distinguished chairman, could provide us with the rationale for the 640,000 who

are mandated to be in the Army Reserve and National Guard.

Mr. HÉBERT. I am delighted that my distinguished colleague and a member of my committee has brought this matter to my attention. It was merely an oversight, because this was one of the most important features of the bill.

Your Committee on Armed Services carried out the instructions and mandate of the House. When we took the floor of the House and asked you to give the legislative committee the authority to handle this matter we promised you we would carry out your instructions.

Members will recall that bill, under which by a vote of 378 to 3 this body insisted that its own language in the appropriation bill be retained. So your committee, in keeping with that mandate from you, by a vote of 378 to 3—and the gentleman now on his feet questioning me voted with the 378—reduced the original number we had in the bill on the mandated strength, to correspond to what you told us to do. We have done exactly that on the 640,000. We have carried out your will and your mandate.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NEDZI. I am certain the gentleman is aware that the appropriation act was temporary legislation, and was going to last for only 1 year, and that the present legislation before us is permanent legislation.

At the time we passed that bill there was an excess over the 640,000 men in the Reserve Forces, so really we were not saying very much in the defense appropriation bill.

I, for one, voted to put it to bed, because I believed it was important that the Army, Navy, Air Force, and all the other Defense Department agencies who need money to carry on the important aspects of our national security have this kind of authorization. It was not any mandate to any committee to authorize as permanent legislation a reserve establishment of 60,000 in excess of what the testimony before our committee indicated was necessary.

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the gentleman for his question.

Now let us see what the facts are. We have objected continuously and continually against legislation on appropriation bills. The necessity for using this method was a case of expediency.

We had no alternative in order to carry out the mandate of the Congress and carry out the intention and belief of the Congress in order to preserve the Reserve organization strength as we understand it. Last year the same method was relied upon and the admonition was also given by the Committee on Appropriations, recognizing the authority of the legislative committee to come up with permanent legislation in order to do away with this piecemeal, year-by-year trial in the Committee on Appropriations. We have done that. I do not know whether the gentleman accepts it as a mandate, but I certainly do accept

as a mandate the 378-to-3 vote. I stood in the well of this House on that particular day before that vote was taken and made the solemn promise that if we were given the opportunity on the legislative committee, that that committee would come out with a bill. I am reminded right now of a saying which goes:

A promise you keep and all night you sleep. A promise you break and all night you wake.

I have not had a sleepless night since I made that promise.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. NEDZI. The gentleman is not addressing himself to the question I raised; namely, that in our testimony and the testimony presented by the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army it was pointed out our contingency war plans have a requirement of only 580,000 reservists. The legislation that is before the House today calls for 640,000 reservists. I am trying to determine where this 640,000 figure came from, because there is no testimony to that effect in any of our hearings.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman is well aware that a letter from the Assistant Secretary—

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The testimony previously was that 688,000 are required.

Mr. HÉBERT. I was just about to say that. They want 688,000. That is the testimony.

Mr. NEDZI. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HÉBERT. No. Let me finish. In explanation of what my chairman just mentioned, he holds in his hand a document from the Assistant Secretary of Defense mentioning this 688,000 figure. Now, the gentleman well knows that nobody in the Department of Defense speaks except under the authority of the Secretary of Defense. All of the generals and all of the admirals and all of the king's men and anybody else you want to name could be brought before the committee to testify, as the gentleman seemed to insist he wanted them to do, and all they would do is parrot and echo what is in that one letter. I refused to waste the time of the committee or the gentlemen who have important jobs to do, so I took the letter from this Department. The gentleman knows further—and this is nothing new and is no disparagement of the gentleman—that in every instance in which we have come to grips with the Pentagon the gentleman has stood alone with the Pentagon while the entire committee voted the other way.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman from South Carolina stated the situation as

it appeared in our hearings. Even had there been a lesser number called upon in the contingency plans or the war plans than in this bill, it would be still a good thing to have some flexibility so that future war plans which might require a greater number of reservists could be accommodated under this bill without having to come back and amend the bill.

Let me say to the gentleman further that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I am very pleased indeed to see this action being taken today. We have had to go through stopgap legislation on an appropriation bill to keep the Reserves from being merged and destroyed. I am very glad indeed to see action being taken now by the great Committee on Armed Services which is permanent legislation and which will reflect the will of the House as expressed in the last 2 years in riders to appropriation bills.

Mr. HÉBERT. I concur with the gentleman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, Congressman HÉBERT, chairman of the subcommittee which developed this legislation, H.R. 17195, has provided the House with a comprehensive and detailed description of the various provisions of the bill. Therefore, I will not prevail on your time to reemphasize these details.

On the other hand, I believe it vitally important that I reemphasize the strong convictions of the Committee on Armed Services in respect to this legislation.

The bill as reported by the committee was given almost unanimous support—the vote being 34 to 1. This vote, therefore, emphasizes the strong views of the Committee on Armed Services that enactment of this legislation into law is vitally important to the future of our Reserve component forces.

Recently, the House resoundingly defeated an effort to include in the fiscal year 1967 Department of Defense Appropriations Act legislative language which would have authorized the President to involuntarily order to active duty approximately 472,000 of the 672,000 Army Reserve personnel attached to units in the organized Army Reserve and National Guard program.

The action of the House in rejecting this legislative language was prompted by its unwillingness to buy without debate or committee hearings a legislative recommendation which would have had far-reaching implications. At that time, I told the Members of this body that there was presently in process a legislative proposal developed by the Committee on Armed Services which addressed itself to this subject.

The bill before the House today, in section 105, includes language which would permit the President, if he deemed it necessary, to involuntarily order to active duty approximately 190,000 reservists. As explained to you by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], approximately 133,000 of

this group are individuals presently attached to drilling units in the Army Reserve and National Guard who have not received their minimum period of 4 months or more of active duty training.

The Committee on Armed Services singled out this group of Reserve personnel for possible call to active duty since their withdrawal from drilling units will least affect the operational capabilities and unit integrity of the organization affected and will permit our Reserve Forces to share a portion of the burden of the Vietnam war.

I wish to emphasize that the language of this provision in section 105 is completely permissive and does not require the President to utilize this authority if he does not consider it essential to the national security.

I wish also to emphasize that this authority is temporary in nature and will expire on July 1, 1968.

Although some Members of this body have raised questions concerning the wisdom of permitting the President to utilize individuals in units without calling up the units, apparently they have forgotten that only a few short years ago the Congress approved President Kennedy's request for similar authority.

Congress, in 1962, approved the enactment of Public Law 87-736 which authorized the President to order both units and individual members of the Ready Reserves to active duty for a period not to exceed 12 consecutive months.

It is evident, therefore, that the Congress has previously given approval to legislation of this type without insisting that the utilization of Reserve manpower be accompanied by the total recall of individual units.

Our Reserve Forces are established for the purpose of augmenting the strength of the Armed Forces during periods of international stress such as those confronting our Nation in Vietnam today.

Unfortunately, the law as presently written precludes the use of our Reserve components unless the President declares a national emergency.

All of us realize that under the circumstances that exist today, it may not be in the national interest for the President to issue a proclamation declaring a national emergency. Such a declaration may have a serious and adverse impact on both our domestic and international affairs.

Such a declaration triggers into effect dozens of other laws providing for increased Presidential authority. Therefore, I can appreciate the President's reluctance to declare a national emergency for the purpose of being in a position to utilize on active duty our Reserve Component Forces.

On the other hand, no similar restraint faces the President in utilizing the manpower resources available through the selective service system. Consequently, the President himself elected to increase our active forces strength through utilization of increased numbers of draftees rather than the call up of Reserve Forces.

This policy decision by the President, therefore, dictates that the Congress must reevaluate its position in respect

to the circumstances under which the President, in the future, may utilize our Reserve Forces.

In light of these facts, I will request that the Committee on Armed Services, when it resumes its hearings on possible changes to the selective service law, include in those hearings a review of the desirability of amending the selective service law in such a fashion as to trigger the statutory authority to use our Reserve Forces when the input into the armed services from the draft exceeds a statutorily prescribed level.

I believe that a change of this kind may very well preclude, in the future, a repetition of the present dilemma confronting both the President and the Congress on future utilization of our Reserve Forces.

In any event, the provision in this bill relating to the possible utilization of a portion of our Reserve manpower is only a temporary measure. A more permanent resolution of this problem will be forthcoming when the Committee on Armed Services reports to the House its recommended changes in the Selective Service Act.

I, therefore, hope that this body will give unanimous approval of H.R. 17195 and thereby endorse the convictions of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Yes, I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], first.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I certainly have the highest respect for the gentleman and the job which he has performed as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. However, I am not sure that I understand this legislation. Perhaps the gentleman from South Carolina can clarify this legislation for me.

As I understand it, the committee is proposing calling up some 130,000 more young men who are members of the Reserve?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. But who have not had training, for various reasons.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The reasons being that there have not been facilities available and they have not been called up?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is what the Defense Department suggests.

Mr. PUCINSKI. They have not been called up for training? What you are saying is that these young men can be called up by the President for a 2-year period simply because—

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If he wants to do that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Because they have not been called up for their 6 months' training? Is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. You may put it that way.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Well, now—

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Wait a minute, now.

For various reasons the Secretary of Defense has not made this training available. If the President wants to utilize these reservists immediately, he could declare an emergency. He does not have to call them. The gentleman must remember that we let President Kennedy do the same thing, without the requirement that he declare a national emergency.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is what I am saying. We do not need any legislation to call these men onto duty for 6 months, if there are training facilities available?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. No.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Because the War Department—because the Defense Department has a right to assign these young men who are now members of the Reserves to 6 months of active duty, if they have the facilities in which to train them; is that correct?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Yes, for 4 months of active duty for training. But that is all.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If I understand your proposal correctly, and I will support you on this, what you are here saying is that a young man who for reasons beyond his control has not been called up for his 6 months' training now is faced with the prospect of being called up for 2 years and being sent to Vietnam. But the young man who is a member of the Ready Reserve and who has put in his 6 months' training in active duty, he will be part of the Reserve component and he cannot be touched. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I think I can answer that very succinctly, but, to be sure that you get it from the horse's mouth, I will ask the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] to respond to that.

Mr. HÉBERT. Your premise is in error that the reason we are calling these people up, or giving the President permission to call them, the reason or the rationale of calling them is to make available to the President desirable manpower and a desirable sharing by the Reserves in the defense of this country with those people who have been drafted and called up.

We have limited their service on the callup by the President to this particular group who have given less service to the Reserve for one reason or the other. We here give him permission to call up some 60,000 who have had 6 months' training but do not drill with a unit and are not attached to a unit.

We do not tell the President that he must do this. We tell the President that these men are available to you in case you need them. He does not have to do it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Let me ask this question at that point.

Supposing then these 130,000 men who are scattered through the various Reserve components and units of the country and are on the table of organization and do not have 6 months training, are now called up by the President and sent down for some training and then sent off some-

where, who will fill the vacancies created in the organizations?

Mr. HÉBERT. There is no problem there at all. Those vacancies will be filled the quickest you have ever seen in your life.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Are we not proposing a double standard then?

Mr. HÉBERT. No, we are not.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Are we not discriminating in some programs if you are going to have a Reserve and you need manpower, why do you not call up a trained unit?

Mr. HÉBERT. That is up to the President. He can do it. But I am telling you that by this we are not discriminating. Instead we are equalizing and sharing the burden between the young men of this country who have been called up in the draft and the young men who have taken advantage of the law—which the Congress gave them the right to do—and who for some reason have not been trained.

But in the bill we recognize the fault and the failure of the Defense Department to train these young men. We recognize that. The bill provides that anybody enlisting in the 6-month program after July 1, 1966, must be trained within 180 days.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. HÉBERT. We are going to make the Defense Department do it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think you have a very good amendment, but I do not understand the other amendment.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Now, at the same time, in addition to this, we are telling the President, "Don't you touch that trained person in that unit. If you want to touch him, you must call up the unit."

The President can call up 190,000 of these young men if he wants to, but he cannot touch the others unless he calls up the units. We are retaining the operational capability and unit integrity of the Reserve and the National Guard.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his very excellent explanation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the committee touched on a point I wanted to raise after the conclusion of his colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois. The adjutant general of my State is worried for fear there is legislation proposed here which will permit the cannibalization of the National Guard units.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Not under this bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Is there anything in this bill that would enable the President to call an individual member of the National Guard units?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Not if he is trained and assigned to a unit, with the safeguards that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] has told us

about, if he has had the training and if he is assigned to a unit, he cannot touch him unless he calls up the unit.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Then they apparently are not going to call up the National Guard units as units at the moment.

Take the case of John Smith who is a member of the regular National Guard unit and trains with that unit regularly, is he subject to call up individually out of that National Guard unit?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. No; not under the bill, he cannot be touched. He cannot be called up.

I want to say this. As I said in the beginning, this is a vital piece of legislation for a group of patriotic young men willing to serve this country in an emergency.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. With respect to the pool of young men who are in the Reserve and who have not yet been trained, is there authority given in this bill to take those young men and to send them into the armed services to active duty without an opportunity for training?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Oh, no, they must have the training, the same as everyone else.

Mr. YATES. Is there a provision in the bill to that effect?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is the law now. They go through the training the same as any other draftee.

Mr. YATES. That is true under the selective service law, but what would be the procedure for training these young men?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. They have to train them. They cannot send them off without training.

Mr. YATES. That is the law under the Selective Service Act?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. YATES. Does the act pertain to the Reserve?

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HEBERT. It also pertains to the policy and the minimum amount of training necessary before an individual can be sent into combat.

Mr. YATES. No matter whether the individual is in the Reserve or not.

Mr. HEBERT. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. What would happen to the Reserve units, for example, Air Force units, that have already been marked to be disbanded, and the order has been made? Would they be affected under this legislation and reinstated?

What would happen?

CXII—1477—Part 17

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HEBERT. The language in the appropriation bill protects those individuals in their units. The money is there.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It protects the units so the unit will not be disbanded?

Mr. HEBERT. In other words, the unit would not be destroyed.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Before I yield to the gentleman from Florida I would like to say that there is no more knowledgeable man in this Congress than the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. He is a long-time reservist who has followed the fortunes of both of these Reserve components. He has helped us immeasurably, and I am delighted to yield to him.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I believe I can cast some additional light on the question of the three National Guard air units scheduled for deactivation.

These units have been serving. In their spare time they have done magnificent work in helping the war effort in Vietnam. They are needed. As they were scheduled to be deactivated, in the defense appropriations bill, which has passed both Houses and which is now in conference, language was provided continuing these units and providing the money for them.

Of course, that cannot make it mandatory that they be kept, but we have since been informed that, recognizing it is the desire of Congress that this be done and recognizing their invaluable service to the Nation and to the war effort, it is planned to keep them in operation.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, one further point on the power that is given to the President to call up the Reserves: Is there any limit or condition on the length of time? How long will it endure? Will it be a permanent peacetime power?

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HEBERT. Existing law permits the President to call a million men for a maximum of 2 years' service if he declares a national emergency.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Is there any limit on his right to call up? Does he have to give any reason?

Mr. HEBERT. The limited authority under this bill to call up 190,000 men expires in 1968.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The President simply advises the Congress of the necessity to utilize this authority?

Mr. HEBERT. That is correct. I think in the area about which you speak, the temporary extension of time to July 1, 1968, perhaps my chairman would like to address himself at this particular time

to the proposed consideration of a possible change in the draft law. This falls right into what you say.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. This is the Hall committee amendment?

Mr. HEBERT. No.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We are going to address ourselves to what you said when we rewrite the Draft Act next year on what the President may do. But he can call up the Reserves in an emergency without assistance from Congress, just as we gave the authority to President Kennedy.

I want to say this. I am glad you brought it up in the light of what we have been discussing. When we resume our hearings on the extension of the selective service law, I am going to recommend that the committee consider the desirability of amending the selective service law in such a fashion as to trigger the statutory authority to use our Reserve Forces when the input into the armed services from the draft exceeds a statutorily prescribed level.

Then we will know exactly where we stand. Remember, under the draft law, the sky is the limit for the President. Many of the complaints that are brought to the Members of this House, the President can change by a stroke of the pen. He can assign priorities, as, for instance, in the case of married people. The President has unlimited power under the draft laws to do that.

I believe the complaints we hear about the Secretaries running these boards and about the part-time students and all these things, we are going to clear up in the extension of this law. There are a lot of things we will try to do when that law comes up for review next year.

Mr. YATES. It is stated, is it not, those not in the Reserve and who have not received training will be given training under the existing law? If this is true, why do we not require that training be given to these boys now and retain them in the Reserves?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Because it is left to the discretion of the Secretary. He claims he does not have the manpower. He claims a million things.

Mr. YATES. What we are doing is taking boys who have been in the Reserve and have not been trained.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. This is the reason this bill is brought to the floor tonight. If the Secretary of Defense observed the desire of Congress in respect to the training of our Reserve Forces, this bill would not be necessary.

Mr. YATES. Is the gentleman saying that the Secretary of Defense can train these boys under the selective service law but cannot train them under the Reserve law?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. He can train them under the Reserve law. That is what I am telling the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Why do we not require him to train them under the Reserve law?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. This is the reason we are asking for the passage of this bill.

Mr. YATES. But we are not going to train them, as I understand it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We are going to train a number, and he cannot touch them and make a joke out of this by taking these people.

Mr. YATES. What the gentleman is saying is that it puts the young man in the middle, between the draft board and the Secretary of Defense. Why can we not require the Secretary of Defense to train the people in the draft?

Mr. HEBERT. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I have had inquiry from some young men who are in the Ready Reserve and who periodically report to some outfit, I mean some unit of which they are part, but they are in college and they want to know whether under this bill, if it passes they will be taken out of the category of the young men who are in college now, and apparently will be permitted to remain there, or whether they will be called up?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am sure I can answer, but would Mr. HEBERT like to take this question?

Are they assigned to a unit?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. They report periodically to a unit.

Mr. HEBERT. If these individuals have a minimum of 4 months of training and are attached to a unit, they are immune from being called up as long as they attend their drills, as long as they fulfill their obligations. They cannot be touched as individuals.

Mr. PEPPER. But do they have training other than this periodic reporting to their units?

Mr. HEBERT. They have had a minimum of 4 months. We can call it 6 months. If they keep current with their obligations, they cannot be called up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17195. As the ranking minority member of the subcommittee which drafted this legislation, I was privileged to participate in all of the hearings which preceded development of the legislation before us today.

In my opinion, the very future of our Reserve component structure rests on the action which the Congress will take on this bill.

Congress, through the years, has given generous financial support to the Reserve program. Each year there is included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act funds approximating \$2 billion in support of these forces. Surely, with this type of financial support, the Congress and the taxpayers of America have a right to expect that their Reserve component structure is one fully capable of satisfying the mobilization requirements established for it by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Unfortunately, this is not true. Our Army Reserve Forces today, except for a few selected Reserve units, are woefully incapable of meeting the readiness requirements established by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Congress has been repeatedly reassured that a variety of changes in units of the Reserve components would overcome the obvious lack of readiness in these units. Alas, these assurances were without foundation.

The Department of Defense and particularly its civilian executives have only given lip service to these assurances. The lack of Reserve readiness is directly the result of the failure of the Pentagon to discharge its duties and responsibilities. Therefore, it is evident that Congress must exercise its constitutional authority "to raise armies" and stipulate in the statutory requirements that they will and must be met.

The bill before you today has received the enthusiastic endorsement of every veterans and service organization directly interested in our national security program.

Even the Department of Defense has reluctantly acknowledged the desirability of many of the provisions in this bill. Yet, for some unexplained reason, the Department refuses to endorse this legislation despite the fact that its provisions would simply put into law the very same assurances the Congress has been given by the executive branch.

This legislation does not dictate the unit structure of the Reserve components. It specifically provides that the unit structure of the Reserve components will be that required by our contingency and war plans.

This legislation does not require the Department to spend 1 penny for equipment and facilities which are not required in our war and contingency plans. It simply requires that once a unit is established, that it be properly supported by the Secretary of the service concerned with personnel, equipment, and facilities both for training and ultimately for mobilization.

I should like to remind our friends in the Pentagon that the Congress and the taxpayers of America have a right to expect an efficiently organized and administered Reserve component program.

This legislation will serve that objective and give direction and leadership to the thousands of young Americans who, for no selfish reason, are dedicated to the defense of our country.

To illustrate the importance of our Reserve Forces I will include in the RECORD at this point, a brief summary of the utilization of these forces since World War II:

RESERVE CALLS TO ACTIVE FEDERAL SERVICE— WORLD WAR II TO DATE

1. Korean call up: 1 Jul 50–26 Jul 53.

Authorized by Presidential Proclamation No. 2914 of 16 December 1950 in which President Truman proclaimed the existence of a national emergency.

Reservists were called to active duty for a period of 24 months under the provisions of this proclamation.

Component:	Reservists called to Active duty
Army National Guard.....	139,000
Army Reserves.....	244,300
Navy Reserves.....	274,563
Marine Corps Reserves.....	98,229
Air National Guard.....	46,413
Air Force Reserves.....	135,874

Total called..... 938,379

2. Little Rock, Ark., call up: 24 Sep 57–29 May 58.

Authorized by (President Eisenhower) Exec. Order 10730 of 23 Sep 57.

Called to active duty: 9,873 Off & EM.

Ark. Army Nat'l Guard.

Ark. Air Nat'l Guard.

Released from active duty 10 Nov 57—8,973 Off & EM.

Retained on active duty till 29 May 58—900 Off & EM.

3. Berlin call up: 1 Oct 61–31 Aug 62.

Authorized by Joint Resolution (PL 87-117) of 1 Aug 1961.

(Authorized President to call 250,000 Ready Reservists to active duty for one year; as units or individuals.)

Called to active duty 1 Oct–1 Nov 61:

Total..... 155,800

Army..... 119,622

Navy..... 8,357

Marine Corps..... 0

Air Force..... 27,821

Reported and served 1 Oct 61–31 Aug 62:

Total..... 147,849

Army (ARes 45,830; ARNG 67,424) -- 113,254

Navy..... 8,020

Marine Corps..... 0

Air Force (AFR 3,187; ANG 23,388) -- 26,575

(94,200 of Jt Res quota of 250,000 spaces not used.) All Released by 31 Aug 1962.

4. Oxford, Miss., call-up: 30 Sep 62–23 Oct 62.

Authorized by President Kennedy (Exec. Order 11053 of 30 Sep 62 (Sec. 3)).

Called to active duty: Miss. Guard, 10,927. Miss. Army Nat'l Guard, 9,894 Off & EM, 122 units; 946 Off & War Off; 8,948 EM.

Miss. Air Nat'l Guard, 1,033 Off & EM, 4 units. Source, Nat'l Guard Bureau Fact Sheets and Press Releases.

5. Cuban call-up: 27 Oct 62–1 Nov 62.

Authorized by Joint Resolution (PL 87-736) of 3 Oct 1962.

(Authorized President to call 150,000 Ready Reservists for 12 months.)

Called to active duty, 27 Oct 62:

AFRes..... 14,200

Reported (in 9 hrs) and served, 27 Oct 62:

AFRes (Off 2,101; EM 11,924)..... 14,025

Released 21 Nov 1962.

6. Tuscaloosa, Ala., call-up: 11 Jun 63–11 Jul 63.

Authorized by President Kennedy (Exec. Order 11111 of 11 Jun 63).

Called to active duty: Alabama Nat'l Guard, 16,463.

Ala. Army Nat'l Guard, 14,435, 154 units; 1,340 Off & WO; 13,095 EM.

Ala. Air Nat'l Guard: 2,028 Off & EM, 17 units.

7. Integration of Public Schools, Ala., call-up: 10–14 Sep 63.

Authorized by Exec. Order 11118 of 10 Sep 63.

Called to active duty: Ala. Army Nat'l Guard and Air Nat'l Guard—called to Active Duty but held in their armories on standby for the four-day period involved.

8. Selma, Ala., call-up: 20–29 Mar 65.

Authorized by President Johnson (Exec. Order 11207 of 20 Mar 65).

Called to Active Duty: Ala. ARNG, Ala. AirNG, total, 4,000 Off & EM.

Summary of use of State military forces in civil disturbances since World War II

Date	Place	Nature of disturbance	Control of troops	Number of troops
Sept. 29 to Oct. 3, 1945	Indiana	Industrial dispute	State	1,480 National Guard.
Feb. 25-28, 1946	Columbia, Tenn.	Race riot	do	775 National Guard.
Aug. 4-6, 1946	Connersville, Ind.	Industrial dispute	do	About 1,000 National Guard.
October 1947	Arizona	do	do	Unknown.
May 14-22, 1948	St. Paul and Newport, Minn.	do	do	2,500 National Guard.
May 19, 1948	Waterloo, Iowa	do	do	1,000 National Guard.
Oct. 30, 1948	Loudon, Tenn.	Threat to local sheriff	do	About 50 National Guard.
July 19, 1949	Groveland, Fla.	Racial disturbance	do	200 National Guard.
May 19, 1950	South Amboy, N.J.	Disturbances following natural disaster	do	400 National Guard.
May 29, 1950	Morristown, Tenn.	Industrial dispute	do	300 National Guard.
Oct. 30 to Nov. 6, 1950	Puerto Rico	Uprising against government	Territorial government	About 5,000 National Guard.
July 12-17, 1951	Cleora, Ill.	Race riot	State	500 National Guard.
Apr. 20-24, 1952	Jackson, Mich.	Prison riot	do	40 National Guard (others on alert).
May 20, 1952	Columbia, Mo.	Student riot	do	About 100 National Guard.
Oct. 31 to Nov. 6, 1952	Columbus, Ohio	Prison riot	do	700 National Guard.
June 18, 1954 to Jan. 19, 1955	Phenix City, Ala.	Crisis in law enforcement	do	About 500 National Guard.
Sept. 23, 1954	Jefferson City, Mo.	Prison riot	do	Unknown.
Oct. 11-12, 1954	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	do	do	120 National Guard.
Aug. 16-21, 1955	Lincoln, Neb.	do	do	About 300 National Guard.
Aug. 27-31, 1955	Whiting, Ind.	Disturbances following natural disaster	do	200 National Guard.
Sept. 9, 1955	Gulfport, Miss.	Crisis in law enforcement	do	40 National Guard.
Oct. 5-20, 1955	New Castle, Ind.	Industrial dispute	do	1,000 National Guard.
Jan. 11-14, 1956	Pensacola, Fla.	do	do	315 National Guard.
Feb. 26-27, 1956	Daytona Beach, Fla.	Teenage riot	do	About 200 National Guard.
Sept. 2-11, 1956	Clinton, Tenn.	School integration crisis	do	600 National Guard.
Sept. 5-11, 1956	Sturgis, Ky.	do	do	200 National Guard.
Sept. 12-22, 1956	Clay, Ky.	do	do	390 National Guard.
February 1957	Portsmouth, Ohio	Industrial dispute	do	76 National Guard.
Sept. 2-20, 1957	Little Rock, Ark.	School integration crisis	do	280 National Guard.
Sept. 24, 1957 to May 29, 1958	do	do	Federal	10,000 National Guard called to Federal service. 1,800 National Guard utilized.
Apr. 18, 1959	Deer Lodge, Mont.	Prison riot	State	200 National Guard.
Apr. 24 to May 1959	Hazard, Ky.	Industrial dispute	do	2,000 National Guard.
June 4-25, 1959	Henderson, N.C.	do	do	305 National Guard (Air).
Dec. 10, 1959 to Jan. 4, 1960	Albert Lea, Minn.	do	do	275 National Guard.
July 2-3, 1960	Newport, R.I.	Teenage riot	do	About 500 National Guard; 50 marines.
May 14-29, 1961	Anniston, Birmingham, Mont-gomery, Ala.	Racial disturbance (Freedom Riders).	do	800 National Guard.
August 1961	Nashville, Tenn.	Prison riot	do	20 National Guard.
Do	Coeur d'Alene, Idaho	Teenage riot	do	25 National Guard.
Dec. 14, 1961	Albany, Ga.	Racial disturbance (civil rights)	do	150 National Guard.
Sept. 30, 1962 to July 24, 1963	Oxford, Miss.	University integration crisis	Federal	12,000 Active Army, 2,700 federalized National Guard in area; 20,600 Active Army and 10,400 Federal National Guard at one time available for service.
Oct. 13 to Nov. 4, 1962	Natchez, Miss.	"Operation Chlorine"—Potential danger from 4 tanks of chlorine gas sunk in river.	State	7,500 Army and Air National Guard.
June 11 to Nov. 20, 1963	Tuscaloosa and Huntsville, Ala.	University integration crisis	Federal	16,000 mobilized. 4,000 National Guard on duty after 3 days; only 300 on duty by September.
June 14, 1963, to July 11, 1964	Cambridge, Md.	Racial disturbance (civil rights)	State	500 National Guard.
Aug. 28, 1963	Washington, D.C.	Civil rights demonstration	District of Columbia Commissioners.	2,000 National Guard; 4,000 Active Army alerted.
Sept. 10, 1963	Birmingham, Mobile, and Tuskegee, Ala.	School integration crisis	State; then Federal	16,000 National Guard mobilized; about 400 National Guard on active duty in three armories.
Mar. 27 to Apr. 15, 1964	Anchorage and Kodiak, Alaska	Earthquake and tidal wave	State	1,350 Army and Air National Guard.
May 28, 1964	Hillsdale, Mich.	Industrial dispute	do	900 National Guard.
July 26-28, 1964	Rochester, N.Y.	Race riot	do	1,300 National Guard.
Mar. 20 to Apr. 3, 1965	Selma to Montgomery, Ala.	Civil rights demonstration	Federal	Entire Alabama National Guard mobilized.
Aug. 13-22, 1965	Los Angeles, Calif.	Watts race riot	State	8,674 National Guard.
Aug. 22, 1965	Springfield, Mass.	Civil rights demonstration	do	2,200 National Guard.
Sept. 3-6, 1965	Natchez, Miss.	Racial disturbance (civil rights)	do	600 National Guard.
July 4-5, 1966	Omaha, Nebr.	Race riot	do	883 National Guard.
July 15-19, 1966	Chicago, Ill.	Fillmore race riot	do	4,674 National Guard.
July 19-31, 1966	Cleveland, Ohio	Hough race riot	do	1,771 National Guard.
Aug. 28-30, 1966	Watwatosa, Wis.	Racial disturbance	do	575 National Guard.
Aug. 31 to Sept. 5, 1966	Benton Harbor, Mich.	do	do	293 National Guard.
Sept. 1-7, 1966	Dayton, Ohio	Race riot	do	1,142 National Guard.
Sept. 4, 1966	Chicago, Ill.	Civil rights demonstration and racial disturbance.	do	2,850 National Guard.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17195. As one of the members of the subcommittee which drafted this legislation, I would like to make clear to the Members of this body the fact that the mandated personnel strength included in this legislation is a proper discharge of the constitutional responsibilities of the Congress.

Article I, section 8, clauses 11, 12, 13, and 14, of the Constitution of the United States specifically reserves to the Congress the responsibility, among other

things, "to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy." These powers were not inserted in the Constitution for the purpose of endowing the National Government with power to do these things, but rather to designate the department of Government which should exercise such powers. Moreover, they permit Congress to take measures essential to the national defense in time of peace as well as during a period of actual conflict.

As a consequence of this authority, the Congress has from time to time exercised this constitutional responsibility in establishing the "military policy of the Nation" as regards the authorized per-

sonnel strengths of the Armed Forces. See sections 3221, 3224, and 5013 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 62 of the National Defense Act of 1916 (39 Stat. 198) specifically established a mandatory strength for the National Guard. Among other things, the language of section 62 provided that there shall be "a total peace strength of not less than 800 enlisted men for each Senator and each Representative in Congress."

The Congress, in Public Law 82-416—section 5013 of title 10, United States Code—stated that the Marine Corps shall consist of not less than three combat divisions and three air wings. This

mandate was observed by President Truman after legislation had been signed into law.

Apropos the foregoing legislative precedents for the establishment of minimum personnel strengths in the Armed Forces, Secretary of Defense McNamara, in appearing before the House Armed Services Committee on Monday, February 22, 1965, conceded the right of Congress to establish minimum personnel strengths in the Reserve Forces. Among other things, Mr. McNamara said:

The legislative authority is very clear. It says 700,000 men for '65. Now if you want 700,000 men for '66, you have the right under the constitution to write that into the legislation. And frankly, we have no redress.

It is abundantly clear that the right of Congress to provide a floor on the personnel strengths of the Reserve components is clear and unequivocal. The strengths prescribed in this legislation are precisely those mandated by the Congress in the Department of Defense Fiscal Act for fiscal year 1967.

These strengths will go into effect immediately after the statutory language in the Appropriations Act lapses on July 1, 1967.

Congress must reassert its role and exercise its responsibility with the executive branch in establishing its Armed Forces. This legislation is only a small step forward in that direction but it symbolizes, in my mind, the determination of Congress to once again become an equal partner with the Department of Defense in our national security.

We have come to the end of that era in which the Congress has, by default, permitted the executive branch to arbitrarily take action in respect to our Armed Forces without regard to the wishes and desires of the American people.

This legislation is, therefore, a milestone in the history of the Congress and one in which each of you will have participated by your endorsement of H.R. 17195.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17195. As a member of the subcommittee which drafted this legislation, I want to emphasize two aspects of the bill which are of particular importance.

First, it should be noted that the right of Congress to provide a floor on the personnel strengths of the Reserve components is clear and unequivocal. However, title I does much more than set the minimum levels of personnel strengths. It provides for substantial revision of the composition and administration of the Reserves, thereby enabling the components to move fully and effectively to meet their mobilization readiness requirements as established in the contingency and war plans approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This will insure the continued strength and growth of our Reserve forces as an essential element in our overall defense structure.

In addition, I am particularly pleased about title II since I was one of the early

sponsors of the original measure designed to clarify the status of the National Guard technicians.

A little less than 2 years ago it was brought to my attention that individuals in my congressional district and thousands of others throughout the land did not know for whom they were working. They were then, and still are, civilian technicians engaged by the National Guard. As such, they occupy a most unusual position. Though the Federal Government pays their salaries and the State government limits their activities, both disown them.

The States have maintained that these full-time workers are Federal employees and the Federal Government has repeatedly insisted they are State employees. To further confuse the issue, State courts have backed the States and the Federal courts have sustained the position of the Federal Government. Thus, over 39,000 dedicated men have left in a virtual "no man's land" of public employment. They are, in fact, "orphans" in every sense of the word.

As a consequence of this vague status, the civilian technician has not been adequately provided for by either State or Federal Government. For the most part they have no pension, sick leave, retirement, or compensation benefits. By way of contrast, they do have a mandatory retirement age of 60 and only since 1953 have they been covered by social security. The technician today faces all the job hazards confronting a civilian employee of the Government or private industry. However, in addition, the technician may lose his National Guard membership by virtue of ill health or inability to pass a physical. If this happens, he automatically loses his civilian employment as a technician.

This is not a pleasant picture and it should not be allowed to remain on the scene any longer. Fortunately, the bill we are presently considering will rectify the situation.

Briefly, title II would classify National Guard technicians as Federal employees. They would be made eligible for Federal group life and health benefits insurance as well as Federal civil service retirement benefits. Their positions would be converted to the Federal GS—general schedule—and WB—wage board—system at the same or greater compensation. Sick leave, annual leave, military leave, step level, and time-in-grade increases which had been earned would be carried over. In addition, most other Federal employee benefits would become applicable.

I might add that besides the Department of Defense's endorsement of this provision, it has the support of the National Governor's Conference and various service-oriented interest groups.

Mr. Chairman, I have described in some detail inequities in the present law with regard to the National Guard technicians. These men have served their country faithfully for decades not only as civilian employees but as fighting men as well. They ask no special category, no special treatment, no preference before the law. They simply seek recognition and a classification similar to that of their civil service brethren. This bill will

provide just that. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken many times on this subject and on the need for this legislation. A bill of rights for the Reserves is necessary in order to clear the atmosphere of confusion and uncertainty which exists today on the training and utilization of the Nation's Reserve Forces. A very great deal of credit is due the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], under whose leadership the bill was written and to his subcommittee which has brought the bill to the floor. They are rendering a distinct service to the defense of America and the Congress can indeed be grateful for the vital and vigorous leadership which has produced the measure now before us.

This bill is all that is ascribed to it in its title and more. It will remain, if enacted—and I do not doubt that it will be—a lasting monument to the fair-minded and patriotic judgment of this committee and its chairman and a perpetual tribute to the service of each in the Congress.

A great many bills are introduced in each Congress, and the number carried by this one attests to that fact. Most of them are born to be forgotten. But I am convinced that few bills under consideration by the Congress today have greater significance than this one, which historically will bear the name of the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee. I say this not only because of its bearing upon the national security posture of our country, but because it will represent a milestone in the long journey of our Government along the path of constitutional government—a government of laws and not of men.

A number of us here today were in Congress in 1952 when the Reserve Forces Act was passed. It has been amended several times as important new facts were brought to mind and because of the lessons of Korea and Vietnam. By the same token, your committee now proposes to write into law not just your own views, but a compilation of the experience and wisdom of our military and legislative leaders gained in the field of the Reserve programs. I consider that it is an outstanding piece of legislation. It is fair, sensible, and right. And it is timely. It will prevent a set-aside—at least in part—of the Reserve Forces Act. The Congress should not delay its enactment.

Of transcendent importance is the fact that the principal thrust of this legislation is to guarantee strong backup forces for our regular services. For that reason its enactment obviously is in the national interest. We want Reserve com-

ponents for all the Regular Forces which are numerically powerful, well-trained, fully equipped, conscientiously supported and capably commanded. This bill moves positively in that direction.

To my surprise, I hear that this measure is looked upon with less than enthusiasm in the Pentagon. This is astonishing. We all seek a strong defense. We all serve under the same flag. We should be able to join in support of such a meritorious bill. I would hope that its very simplicity, its commonsense, its historic soundness do not work to make it unattractive in some quarters. The modern concept of legislation all too often is something vague and indefinite, incapable of interpretation, but which the departments and the courts later can twist to their own purposes. This is not such a bill.

It is a simple bill. It prescribes that certain minimum strengths which are modest, must be maintained in all the Reserves and that these Reserve components have high level management, that they be properly encouraged, given adequate leadership and equipment with which to go about their missions.

Why then should anyone oppose this bill? In the long run it will save money. It will provide needed military training for thousands of young men. It will add an important element of discipline for those same young men. It will, most importantly, give our Nation added assurance of an adequate military defense in time of danger. As a member of the House committee which provides appropriations for the military services, I am one of a small group which for the past 2 years was wrestled directly with the problem of insuring the continuation of the Reserves. You have had the same experience. We examined the 1964 realignment program and we found it wanting. When it was proposed that the so-called Reserve and National Guard merger be brought about without legislative authority, we rejected that proposal. We in the Appropriations Committee believe that action such as this should be based upon the passage of legislation as, in fact, the statutes specify. The same proposal for merger was rejected again in 1966. In each instance our action was endorsed by the House and by the Senate. This should not go on indefinitely. This uncertainty is producing a chaotic condition within the Reserves which is highly injurious to morale and to efficiency. There has been a drawdown from the Reserves even of the tardily supplied and inadequate equipment which they possessed. They need some certainty for the future. They need to know that their goals are positive and reachable goals, spelled out in the law of the land. This will not be true until there is legislation such as this bill which you now consider.

Now let me touch on a question which has been raised regarding the ability of the services to train those needed for the Reserve components specified in this bill. In the main, these are the so-called untrained pool of reservists who are in the Army backlog. I consider the solution of this problem quite simple. All that is required is to expand the existing training

base or keep open one of those slated for closure, or reactivate a base which previously has been closed. Where there is a need for trainees, this need can be met very simply and promptly by calling up some of the thousands of officers and men of the already trained Reserve Forces for this purpose. There are many who want to serve.

It is as simple as that. All that is needed is the will to carry forward the program. There is no real or costly difficulty involved.

But before I leave the subject, let me point to the fact that those in the so-called untrained Reserve actually are being given training—in their Reserve centers—by the experienced and capable noncommissioned officers and commissioned officers who lead these units. Many of these unit leaders have had combat experience. Under their direction recruits already are gaining training in military essentials on weekends and on weeknights. This training will enhance the active duty training which later will be required for them to achieve full readiness. I think the problem of the Reserve recruit is being overemphasized.

As long as the future of the Reserves can be determined on the basis of personal decision rather than on the basis of law, we are confronted with the danger of failure of policy, the danger of a lack of foresight regarding military personnel needs, training needs and equipment needs, the danger of inability to see mistakes and correct them, even of the actual and awesome danger of an inadequate defense for the Nation. No individual, however capable, and however well intentioned, should have imposed upon him such a responsibility. The law should spell out the exact future of the Reserves and provide guidelines for their most efficient maintenance and utilization.

This is indeed a bill of rights for the Reserves and its passage is greatly needed.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17195. I believe I can say without fear of contradiction that I authored the first bill ever introduced in Congress to give National Guard technicians status as Federal employees for retirement, annual leave, sick leave, and other basic privileges and emoluments enjoyed by Federal employees.

The status of these technicians was first brought to my attention when a personal friend of mine who was an Army National Guard technician suffered a heart attack and was forced to give up that employment. Investigation revealed that he had no retirement benefits of any kind.

He was not a member of the military service and did not qualify for military retirement benefits of any kind. The Federal Government considers the National Guard, until such time as it is ordered to Federal service to be an organization of the State, so that the tech-

nician is not a Federal employee eligible for civil service retirement and benefits.

To complicate the problem further, the States considered the Guard technician not to be a State employee since he was not paid with State funds and he was ineligible for State retirement.

In order to clarify the status of these technicians, I introduced H.R. 7276 in 1961. That bill would have done essentially what title II of H.R. 17195 does. It was referred to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service which asked for comment from the Department of Defense and the Civil Service Commission.

The Department of Defense endorsed the bill and recommended its enactment, but the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget opposed it and because of that opposition, the bill did not receive favorable consideration by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I have been intensely interested in this matter for more than 5 years and have fought for legislation to remedy this situation. I am convinced that these technicians should have their status clarified, and I strongly support the provisions of title II of H.R. 17195 which would accomplish this objective.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 17195 as reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 17195, the Reserve Forces Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act of 1966, and National Guard Technicians Benefits Act. This bill clearly will strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces and will protect units from arbitrary action which would decimate such units. It will clarify the status of reservists who have completed their active duty training and at the same time provide a manpower pool if the need should arise. This is a fair bill and should remove a large measure of the uncertainty of status which in many instances now exists.

Title II of H.R. 17195 will provide a retirement status and eligibility for National Guard technicians who have heretofore been denied a retirement status of any kind because while they have been paid with Federal funds they have been deemed to be State employees of the National Guard of the several States. This legislation to clarify the technicians status and to provide retirement eligibility and benefits is long overdue and I strongly support this portion of this bill.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I support the bill. Particularly I commend the bill for the title dealing with the Air Guard and the National Guard technicians.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY].

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleagues in support of H.R.

17195, the Reserve Forces Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act and the National Guard Technicians Benefits Act.

I address my remarks especially to title II of this bill, that portion dealing with the status of technicians employed by the Army and Air National Guards. One of the first groups to seek my assistance shortly after I came to this Congress in January of 1965 represented our National Guard technicians. I was informed at that time that these men, both employees and at the same time members of the National Guard, were seeking congressional action to determine exactly who their employer was. They described to me a situation wherein neither the Federal Government nor the several States was willing to acknowledge them as employees.

The technicians are hired and fired by the State adjutants general, but their numbers and compensation are fixed by the Federal Government, they care for Federal property, they are paid directly by Federal finance officers from Federal appropriations, and they are governed in the main by Federal regulations. However, the Comptroller General of the United States has consistently ruled that National Guard technicians are not Federal employees. On the one hand, the Department of Labor considers the technicians covered by the Federal Employees Compensation Act, but on the other hand, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that they are not Federal employees within the meaning of the Federal Tort Claims Act. In my own State of New York, the courts there have held that the National Guard technicians are not State employees for purposes of the State's civil service laws. This situation is intolerable, and title II of this bill will make it clear that the technicians are, in law as well as in fact, employees of the U.S. Government.

In my judgment, the failure in the past to clearly define the status of the civilian technicians makes its greatest impact in the area of those normal fringe benefits which all of us have come to consider as part and parcel of civilized employment. At the present time New York's National Guard technicians are neither employees of the Federal Government nor employees of the State. Consequently they receive no protection for old age from either Federal or State retirement systems. Fortunately, the Federal Government does pick up the tab for the employer's share of the social security tax, and so the technician does have social security protection. In addition to this, they do receive retirement credits as a result of their military service. For the technicians, these benefits are payable at age 60 on the basis of 20 or more years of military service. For example, a sergeant major, E-9 rating, will receive \$1,600 per year after 2 years of active duty and 18 years of nonregular creditable service. Consider also the E-7 rating, the old master sergeant, with 2 years of active duty and 18 years of National Guard duty, he will receive \$720 per year. With 28 years of National Guard duty his retirement income will amount to \$1,224 per year. My point

here is that the civilian technician in New York, when he retires or is fired because he can no longer qualify for membership in the National Guard, has only this military retirement to live on until he becomes eligible for social security. This sort of thing is unreasonable and unjust, and title II will provide the necessary relief.

The National Guard civilian technician plays an important part in the military readiness of the Guard. The technicians constitute the full-time nucleus of key personnel assigned to the Guard. I feel that it is important that the Congress recognize the essentially Federal functions performed by the technicians by acting to declare that these dedicated men are employees of the United States, and as such, they are entitled to all the rights and benefits enjoyed by other Federal employees.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI].

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for taking time at this hour, but some of the things that have been going through my mind, in my opinion, should be said today.

This is an extremely complicated bill. I believe that is evident from the colloquy which has taken place.

It is unfortunate we have to discuss a bill of this nature this late in the day.

Mr. Chairman, let me say first that I agree with my chairman and all the members of the Armed Services Committee, when I do point out that some kind of conclusion was necessary to the turmoil which has existed in our Reserve Forces. There is just no question about that. That is why I support this bill in most of its provisions.

The part I take exception to is the second part, as I designate it.

Let me say that there are three parts to this legislation.

A great deal of discussion and debate have taken place with respect to the first part; that is, the question of authorizing the President to call up the Reserves. While I do not believe this is too meaningful, nevertheless the President will have this option, if he wants to exercise it, and I am willing to trust his good judgment in this regard, as to whether it will be useful for him to use this authority, which we propose to give him, or not.

The second part of the bill I tried to discuss with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], the chairman of the subcommittee, in order to determine just exactly why the mandated figure in this bill was at 640,000. Quite obviously, the thing which motivated the bringing out of this bill and the introduction of this bill was the proposed merger of the National Guard and the Reserve some months ago, as all Members will recall.

This bill effectively stops that merger. At the present time I am prepared to support that concept. My problem is this: During the course of our hearings we never heard a word of testimony about the figure 640,000. We are talking here about the House mandating this

authority a couple of weeks ago when we voted on the Defense Appropriation Act. To me this is not an authorization. As I indicated to the chairman of the committee, it was a rather academic question, because the number in the Reserve Forces at the present time exceeds 640,000. It is 1-year authority. What we are doing here is enacting into permanent legislation a Reserve Force of 640,000, 60,000 in excess of what the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army say is necessary for our contingency war plans. What does this mean? This means we are going to have 60,000 more men than they want in our Reserve Forces and keep them trained and keep them equipped and incur all of the expense that goes with it. But what is more important, in my opinion, is that the fact that we are taking 60,000 men out of the draft pool. I am sure all of you, my colleagues here in the House, have experienced the same thing I have experienced about the Reserves at this time. Let me point out quickly that I am not one who thinks the Reserves are draft dodgers. I do not believe that. At the time that most of them entered the Reserves, there is a serious question as to what was the easy way out, whether to take 2 years of active duty in peacetime or up to 8 years in the Reserves. Many of these men have been there a long time, so they cannot be placed in the category of the draft dodger. But the practical effect of mandating 60,000 men in excess of what any responsible person said was necessary, responsible in this area, just does not make sense, because we are taking them out of the draft pool.

Now, if my chairman will kindly answer this question, I will appreciate it. He indicated earlier that some letter was submitted which indicated we should have a Reserve force of 688,000 men. Could the gentleman from Louisiana be a little more specific than that?

Mr. HÉBERT. The letter I referred to was a letter from Mr. Morris, the Assistant Secretary in Charge of Manpower. The report will show exactly what his words were. It was in reply to an inquiry from the committee as to the strength desired, and he came up with that figure of 688,000.

Mr. NEDZI. The chairman will recall this question arose during the course of the hearings on this particular legislation, and at that time it was pointed out that this was a mobilization strength and not the actual strength that we need in the Reserve at the present time.

Mr. HÉBERT. It was pointed out, if the gentleman will yield to me, that it was an immediate—and I emphasize and underscore the word "immediate"—mobilization figure. I do not know how you can get more immediate than immediate. That means right now and not 30, 60, or 90 days later.

Mr. NEDZI. Because this issue was raised I contacted the Assistant Secretary of Defense and asked him to clarify the statement which was made. He addressed this letter to me on yesterday, and I quote—let me paraphrase what is

in the letter—"Therefore the total paid drill strength of the Army Reserve component should be 580,000. It is not considered necessary to man our units of Reserve components at 100 percent of full strength prior to the time they are mobilized. This is because there is a large number of trained individuals in the Ready Reserve pool who are available to be called to active duty to serve as filler to bring Reserve units to 100 percent strength when mobilization occurs."

Now, this clearly indicates that Mr. Morris, when he submitted the data requested by the committee, did not maintain a total Reserve of 688,000 was needed. If he did, then why cut it down to 640,000? I address that question to the chairman.

Mr. HEBERT. I am very happy and delighted that the Pentagon, after all of these weeks, has finally gotten around to reexplaining itself with some conjured up doubletalk. However, I will say to the gentleman that this mandate is a floor and not a ceiling. It is a floor and not a ceiling. It can be raised at any time. As the gentlemen well know and should know, because he is in very close contact with the Pentagon at all times, our problem is to make the Pentagon do what it says it wants to do and stop giving lipservice only.

Mr. NEDZI. I find it difficult to fence with my distinguished chairman from Louisiana. However, the chairman knows that this issue was discussed in the committee, and he is taking advantage of this poor little lonesome soul on his subcommittee.

Mr. HEBERT. Will the gentleman yield further? May I say he is not a lonesome soul who can take on eight stalwarts. However, I will admit this subject matter was considered by nine men tried and true and wise in the ways of the military, and eight of them came up with an answer opposite of what the gentleman advocates. So he stands alone.

Mr. NEDZI. The fact remains, however, that at this time there is no evidence, there is no testimony before the Armed Services Committee, which supports a figure of 640,000.

I am not sure that it is the will of this House to place 60,000 more men into the Reserve Forces by anyone who is charged with this responsibility who says it is necessary.

Really, I do not know from where that figure came. And, if you listened carefully to the colloquy that has taken place, it has not been disclosed from where the 640,000 figure came.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I propose to offer an amendment to strike the additional 60,000 from this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated from the outset, I find no fault with title II of the bill and with section 201 concerning the National Guard technicians.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEDZI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. What, if any, position has the Secretary of Defense taken with respect to this bill, and what, if any, position has the head of the Selective Service, General Hershey, taken on this bill? We have listened but have not heard anyone representing their position.

I would be interested in knowing if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] is aware of any position that they have taken with reference to this legislation.

Mr. NEDZI. I might state to the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] that I am completely unaware of what position General Hershey may have taken with respect to the bill. I am also positive that the Secretary of Defense is opposed to the bill, even with my proposed amendment, because this, in effect, prevents the kind of flexibility which some may think is desirable. Permit me to say that there is not a valid argument contained therein. Our Reserve Forces cannot be taken in a vacuum. They have to be considered in light of our total Armed Forces. It seems to me to be unwise to follow this course.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, just one other comment. I have one additional request for time. But, in order that the gentleman from Michigan may be permitted to keep the record straight, I hold in my hand a copy of the committee hearings on this bill. Pages 10793-10802 provide quite a bit of evidence to substantiate the figures we have, and I say to the gentleman that with all his wit and with all his guile—

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, is that Mr. Morris' letter?

Mr. HEBERT. That is Mr. Morris' letter which I use as the valid testimony.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I would like my letter from Secretary Morris to appear in the RECORD at this point, since I believe it clarifies the matter.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., September 21, 1966.

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NEDZI: In response to your request, the additional information in the following paragraphs is forwarded to clarify some of the data incorporated in my letter to the Chairman of Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Armed Services Committee dated 19 August 1966 in answer to certain questions regarding personnel and funding requirements for the reserve components.

As you know, the Department of Defense and Department of the Army, through the testimony of both senior civilian and military officials, have consistently taken the position that the units in the Army's Reserve Components should consist of 8 divisions, 16 brigades, necessary combat support and combat service support units, with a total, pre-mobilization, paid drill strength of 550,000. In addition, there is a temporary requirement for 30,000 additional personnel to bring the units of the Selected Reserve Force to 100% strength. Temporarily, therefore, the total paid drill strength of the Army's Reserve Components should be 580,000.

It is not considered necessary to man all units of the Reserve Components at 100% of full strength, prior to the time they are mobilized. This is because there is a large

number of trained individuals in the Ready Reserve Pool who are available to be called to active duty to serve as fillers to bring reserve units to 100% strength when mobilization occurs.

In line with the foregoing, the data provided in my 19 August letter showed that the authorized strength of the Army reserve components proposed for fiscal year 1967 was 580,000, including 30,000 to bring the Selected Reserve Force to 100% strength. By a footnote it was made clear that this strength is at the level considered necessary to conduct effective pre-mobilization training so as to achieve the readiness level required, and that, in the event of mobilization, additional personnel would be provided from the Ready Reserve Pool to bring these units to 100% strength. In a separate tabulation it was noted that the number of filler personnel required to bring these units to 100% strength would total about 108,000.

Very briefly, therefore, the foregoing may be summarized as follows:

a. The total paid drill strength presently required in the units of the Army reserve components prior to mobilization is 580,000.

b. These units, if mobilized, would be expanded after mobilization to a strength of about 688,000.

c. This expansion would be accomplished by assigning trained individuals from the Ready Reserve Pool.

I trust the foregoing will assist in clarifying the Department of Defense and Department of the Army position in this matter.

Sincerely,

THOMAS D. MORRIS.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 17195. I early introduced legislation of a similar nature; but I am glad to say that the committee product that is before us now is an improvement in many important respects. The bill will give stability to the Reserves, which are an important segment of our defense. It will provide for adequate strength levels, adequate training and availability for the Commander in Chief to utilize, as the needs arise. I sincerely hope that the bill will pass unanimously as it is manifestly greatly needed.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, hearings conducted by a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee have, in my opinion, revealed an urgent need for prompt enactment of H.R. 17195, the Reserve Forces Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act of 1966, which is before this body today for consideration. They further indicate that the proposal to merge the Army Reserve with the Army National Guard created deficiencies which will not be corrected until Congress takes appropriate action. It is my understanding that this legislation is designed to do just this.

I realize, of course, the importance of both titles of the bill. However, I am especially interested in title II which would establish a Federal employee status for technicians employed by the National Guard and make more than 39,000 Army and Air National Guard technicians eligible for Federal retirement, health, and insurance benefits. Therefore, I am happy to lend my support to this measure and I hope that it will be promptly passed.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17195. During my

tenure on the Committee on Armed Services, I have had the privilege of participating in the drafting and development of many legislative proposals affecting the Armed Forces. However, in all of this time, I have never seen a subcommittee work more diligently than Mr. HEBERT's subcommittee which developed this admittedly complex but very constructive legislative recommendation.

The comprehensive review made by Subcommittee No. 2 of the entire Reserve problem encompasses a period of approximately 5 years. During that time, the subcommittee compiled a most extensive and detailed record of Reserve activities which now have culminated in the recommendations of both this subcommittee and its parent committee, the Committee on Armed Services.

For purposes of the record, these extensive hearings should be documented so as to enable those Members of the House who may wish, to review the efforts which culminated in this legislation. These documents are as follows:

Committee on Armed Services Document No. 66, of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, entitled "Military Reserve Posture Hearings," consisting of over 1,100 pages of printed testimony and exhibits, was accompanied by a committee report identified as Committee Document No. 70 of the 87th Congress, 2d session, entitled "Military Reserve Posture," and dated August 17, 1962.

Committee Document No. 39, of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, entitled "Merger of the Army Reserve Components," consisting of approximately 1,000 pages of printed testimony and accompanying exhibits.

Committee Document No. 86, of the 89th Congress, 2d session, entitled "Hearings on H.R. 16435 and H.R. 17195," consisting of more than 160 pages of printed testimony.

In summary, the legislation before you today is supported by more than 2,200 pages of printed testimony. This fact is significant in that it reveals the depth of the study and review made by the Committee on Armed Services before the committee arrived at the recommendations embodied in this legislation today.

I, therefore, urge the unanimous approval of this bill by the Members of this House.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute amendment printed in the original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title I of this Act may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act of 1966".

TITLE I—RESERVE FORCES

SEC. 101. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 101(2) is amended by inserting "Except as provided in section 101(1) of title 32 for laws relating to the militia, the National Guard, the Army National Guard of

the United States, and the Air National Guard of the United States," before "Territory" means".

(2) Section 136(a) is amended by striking out "seven" and inserting "eight" in place thereof.

(3) Section 136(b) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following:

"One Assistant Secretary shall be the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs and shall, as his principal duty, be responsible for the administration, operation, and readiness of the reserve components of the armed forces under the Department of Defense."

(4) The text of section 175 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is in the Office of the Secretary of Defense a Reserve Forces Policy Board consisting of—

"(1) the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs who is Chairman of the Board;

"(2) the Assistant Secretary of each of the military departments, designated under section 264(b) of this title, who is responsible for reserve affairs in his department;

"(3) an officer of the Regular Army designated by the Secretary of the Army;

"(4) an officer of the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps designated by the Secretary of the Navy;

"(5) an officer of the Regular Air Force designated by the Secretary of the Air Force;

"(6) four reserve officers designated by the Secretary of the Army, two of whom must be members of the Army National Guard of the United States, and two of whom must be members of the Army Reserve;

"(7) four reserve officers designated by the Secretary of the Navy, two of whom must be members of the Naval Reserve, and two of whom must be members of the Marine Corps Reserve;

"(8) four reserve officers designated by the Secretary of the Air Force, two of whom must be members of the Air National Guard of the United States, and two of whom must be members of the Air Force Reserve;

"(9) three civilian members, representatives of the labor, industrial, and educational communities, designated by the Secretary of Defense; and

"(10) a reserve officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps who is a general or flag officer, designated by the Chairman of the Board and who serves without vote as military adviser to the Chairman and as executive officer of the Board.

"(b) Whenever the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury may designate an officer of the Regular Coast Guard or the Coast Guard Reserve to serve as a voting member of the Board.

"(c) The Board, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs appointed under section 136(b) of this title, is the principal policy adviser to the Secretary of Defense on matters relating to the reserve components.

"(d) This section does not affect the committees on reserve policies prescribed by section 3033, 5251, 5252, or 8033 of this title.

"(e) A member of a committee or board prescribed under a section listed in subsection (d) may, if otherwise eligible, be a member of the Reserve Forces Policy Board.

"(f) The Board shall act on those matters referred to it by the Chairman and, in addition, on any matter raised by a member of the Board. However, a majority of the members present may agree to postpone or table any matter referred to the Board by either the Chairman or a member of the Board.

"(g) The Board shall meet at least once every three months and at such times as the Chairman may determine."

(5) Section 262 is amended by striking out "the reserve components" and inserting "each reserve component" in place thereof.

(6) The text of section 264 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs has responsibility for reserve affairs of the Department of Defense.

"(b) The Secretary concerned shall designate an Assistant Secretary of his department who shall have as his principal duty responsibility for the establishment and execution of policy on all matters related to manpower and reserve affairs. The Assistant Secretary shall, in connection with reserve affairs, be responsible for the administration, operation, and readiness of the reserve components under that department.

"(c) The Secretary concerned shall designate a general or flag officer for each reserve component under his jurisdiction to be directly responsible for reserve affairs to the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, as the case may be. This subsection does not affect the functions of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, the Chief of Army Reserve, or the Chief of Air Force Reserve.

"(d) The Secretary concerned is responsible for providing the personnel, equipment, facilities, and other general logistic support necessary to enable units and Reserves in the Selected Reserve of the reserve components under this jurisdiction to satisfy the mobilization readiness requirements established for those units and Reserves in the contingency and war plans approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He shall, when a unit in the Selected Reserve is established and designated, expeditiously procure, issue, and maintain supplies and equipment of combat standard quality in amounts required for the training of each unit and shall store and maintain such additional supplies and equipment of that quality that are required by those units upon mobilization. However, if the Secretary concerned determines that compliance with the preceding provisions of this subsection will jeopardize the national security interests of the United States, he may temporarily waive compliance with these requirements after he has notified Congress in writing, setting forth the specific facts and circumstances upon which he made such a determination. Unless specifically authorized by law enacted after the effective date of this section, funds authorized for personnel, supplies, equipment, and facilities for a reserve component may not be transferred or expended for any other purpose."

(7) Section 268 is amended by inserting the designation "(a)" at the beginning and adding the following new subsection:

"(b) There is a Selected Reserve within the Ready Reserve of each of the following—

- "(1) the Army Reserve;
- "(2) the Naval Reserve;
- "(3) the Marine Corps Reserve;
- "(4) the Air Force Reserve; and
- "(5) the Coast Guard Reserve.

The Selected Reserve consists of the Army National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, and such units and Reserves named in clause (1)–(5) as the Secretary concerned may designate, trained as prescribed in section 270 (a) (1) of this title or section 502(a) of title 32, as appropriate."

(8) Section 269(e) (1)–(6) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) he served on active duty (other than for training) in the armed forces for an aggregate of at least five years; and

"(2) he served on active duty (other than for training) in the armed forces for an aggregate of less than four years, but satisfactorily participated, as determined by the Secretary concerned, in an accredited training program in the Ready Reserve for a pe-

riod which, when added to his period of active duty (other than for training), totals at least five years, or such shorter period as the Secretary concerned, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense in the case of a Secretary of a military department, may prescribe for satisfactory participation in an accredited training program designated by the Secretary concerned."

(9) Section 270(a)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) participate in the equivalent of at least 48 scheduled drills or training periods during each year and serve on active duty for training or perform annual field training of not less than 14 days (exclusive of travel-time) during each year;"

(10) Section 511(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, a non-prior-service person who is under 26 years of age, who is qualified for induction for active duty in an armed force, and who is not under orders to report for induction into an armed force under sections 451-473 of title 50, appendix, may be enlisted in the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, or as a Reserve for service in the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Air Force Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve, for a term of six years. Each person enlisted under the authority provided by this subsection-period of active duty for training of not less than four months to commence within 180 days after the date of that enlistment. Notwithstanding the foregoing, a person enlisted under the authority provided by this subsection before July 1, 1966, who has not completed an initial period of active duty for training of four months or more, may be considered to have completed the equivalent of eight weeks of basic training if he has served on active duty, active duty for training, or full-time training duty for 15 days and has satisfactorily participated in 45 scheduled drills or equivalent training periods. However, the additional period of advanced active duty training or full-time training duty required by such enlistee to qualify for the billet in which enlistee must be completed unless such enlistee has received the equivalent training necessary to qualify him for the satisfactory performance of his military assignment responsibilities under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned. Upon completing such training or its equivalent, the member shall be required to satisfactorily perform such other service in the Ready Reserve as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense until he has completed a combination of active duty, active duty for training, full-time training duty, and service in the Ready Reserve or National Guard which aggregates a total of six-years of satisfactory service, as determined by the Secretary concerned."

(11) The text of section 678 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) A reserve commissioned officer ordered to active duty (other than for training) under section 672(d) of this title or other provision of law for special assignment in accordance with section 265, 3033, 3496, 8033, or 8496 of this title, or section 708 of title 32, shall be ordered in his reserve grade, and while so serving, is in addition to the authorized numbers and strength in grades of commissioned officers on active duty in the armed force of which he is a member.

"(b) A reserve commissioned officer on duty under subsection (a) is eligible for temporary promotion in his armed force without component, and for consideration for permanent appointment as a reserve commissioned officer in a grade higher than that in

which he is serving on active duty, to the same extent as if he were not on active duty.

"(c) A reserve commissioned officer on duty under subsection (a) who holds a permanent reserve grade, or is selected for permanent promotion to a reserve grade which is higher than the permanent reserve grade in which he is serving on active duty shall be permanently promoted to the higher reserve grade and continue to serve in that grade while on active duty.

"(d) To assure that a reserve commissioned officer on duty under subsection (a) receives periodic refresher training in the categories for which he is qualified, the Secretary concerned may detail him to duty with any armed force, or otherwise as the Secretary sees fit."

(12) Sections 3013(a), 5034(a), and 8013 (a) are each amended by striking out "three" and inserting in place thereof "four" in the first sentence.

(13) Section 3015 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3015. National Guard Bureau: appointment of Chief, Deputy Chief, Assistant Chief for Army National Guard, Assistant Chief for Air National Guard, and acting chief; functions, policies, and regulations for the National Guard, Army National Guard of the United States, and Air National Guard of the United States

"(a) There is a National Guard Bureau, which is a Joint Bureau of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force, headed by a chief who has direct access to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and is the principal adviser to those Chiefs of Staff on National Guard matters. The National Guard Bureau includes a general counsel, a comptroller, and other personnel necessary to discharge its statutory responsibilities. It is—

"(1) the supervisory and operating agency of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force for the National Guard;

"(2) the channel of communication between the departments concerned and the several States, territories, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia on all matters pertaining to the National Guard, the Army National Guard of the United States, and the Air National Guard of the United States;

"(3) responsible for preserving and maintaining the integrity of the unit and command structure of the National Guard, the Army National Guard of the United States, and the Air National Guard of the United States as separate and distinct parts of the structure of the Army and of the Air Force.

"(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, the Deputy Chief of the National Guard Bureau, the Assistant Chief of the National Guard Bureau for the Army National Guard, and the Assistant Chief of the National Guard Bureau for the Air National Guard, from officers of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States who—

"(1) have been recommended by their respective Governors;

"(2) have had at least 10 years of commissioned service in the active National Guard; and

"(3) are in a grade above lieutenant colonel.

If the Chief of the National Guard Bureau is an officer of the Army National Guard of the United States, the Deputy Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall be appointed from qualified officers of the Air National Guard

of the United States. If the Chief of the National Guard Bureau is an officer of the Air National Guard of the United States, the Deputy Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall be appointed from qualified officers of the Army National Guard of the United States. The Assistant Chief of the National Guard Bureau for the Army National Guard and the Assistant Chief of the National Guard Bureau for the Air National Guard shall be appointed from qualified officers of the Army National Guard of the United States and from qualified and rated officers of the Air National Guard of the United States, respectively.

"(c) The Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the Deputy Chief of the National Guard Bureau hold office for four years, but may be removed for cause at any time. They are eligible to succeed themselves. If either of them holds a lower reserve grade, he shall be appointed as a Reserve in his armed force in the grade of major general for service in the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States, as the case may be.

"(d) The Assistant Chief of the National Guard Bureau for the Army National Guard and the Assistant Chief of the National Guard Bureau for the Air National Guard hold office for four years, but may be removed for cause at any time and may not hold office after they have become 60 years of age. They are eligible to succeed themselves. If either of them holds a lower reserve grade, he shall be appointed as a Reserve in his armed force in the grade of brigadier general for service in the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States, as the case may be.

"(e) If the Chief of the National Guard Bureau is unable, because of disability, to perform the functions of his office, or if that office is vacant, the Deputy Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall act as its Chief until the disability ceases or a successor is appointed."

(14) Item 3015 in the analysis of chapter 303 is amended to read as follows:

"3015. National Guard Bureau: appointment of Chief, Deputy Chief, Assistant Chief for Army National Guard, Assistant Chief for Air National Guard, and acting chief; functions, policies, and regulations for the National Guard, Army National Guard of the United States, and Air National Guard of the United States."

(15) A new section 3019 is added as follows:

"§ 3019. Office of Army Reserve: appointment of Chief, Deputy Chief, and acting chief; functions, policies, and regulations for government of Army Reserve

"(a) There is in the executive part of the Department of the Army an Office of Army Reserve which is headed by a chief who has direct access to the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff, and is the principal adviser to the Chief of Staff, on matters relating to the Army Reserve. The Office of Army Reserve includes a general counsel, a comptroller, and other personnel necessary to discharge its statutory responsibilities. It is—

"(1) the supervisory and operating agency of the Department of the Army for the Army Reserve;

"(2) the Department of the Army agency responsible for coordination of communication between the Department of the Army and its subordinate commands on matters relating to the Army Reserve; and

"(3) responsible for preserving and maintaining the integrity of the unit and command structure of the Army Reserve as a

separate and distinct part of the structure of the Army.

"(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint the Chief of Army Reserve from officers of the Army Reserve not on active duty, or on active duty under section 265 of this title, who—

"(1) have had at least 10 years of commissioned service in the Army Reserve;

"(2) are in grade of brigadier general and above; and

"(3) have been recommended by the Secretary of the Army from a list containing the names of not less than three, or more than five, officers submitted by the General Staff Committee on Army Reserve Policy.

"(c) The Chief of Army Reserve holds office for four years but may be removed for cause at any time. He is eligible to succeed himself. If he holds a lower reserve grade, he shall be appointed in the grade of major general for service in the Army Reserve.

"(d) There is a Deputy Chief of Army Reserve. He shall be nominated by the Chief of Army Reserve and appointed by the Secretary of the Army from officers of the Army Reserve not on active duty, or on active duty under section 265 of this title, who meet the requirements prescribed in subsection (b) (1) and are in the grade of colonel or above. If he holds a lower reserve grade, he shall be appointed in the grade of brigadier general for service in the Army Reserve. He serves in that position for four years and is eligible for appointment as Chief of Army Reserve without a break in active service.

"(e) If the Chief of Army Reserve is unable, because of disability, to perform the functions of his office, or if that office is vacant, the Deputy Chief, or the senior officer of the Army Reserve on duty in the Office of Army Reserve, shall act as its chief until the disability ceases or a successor is appointed."

(16) The following new item is added to the analysis of chapter 303:

"3019. Office of Army Reserve: appointment of Chief, Deputy Chief, and acting chief; functions, policies, and regulations for government of Army Reserve."

(17) The text of section 3033 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is in the office of the Secretary of the Army a General Staff Committee on Army National Guard and Army Reserve Policy which shall review and comment upon each proposed change in Army policy or regulation directly affecting the reserve components of the Army prior to its final submission to the Chief of Staff, and the Assistant Secretary responsible for reserve affairs, for approval. The recommendations of the General Staff Committee shall accompany any proposed change in policy or regulation, or both, when it is acted upon by the Chief of Staff and the Assistant Secretary responsible for reserve affairs.

"(b) The General Staff Committee consists of—

"(1) five general officers of the Regular Army on duty with the Army General Staff;

"(2) five general officers of the Army National Guard of the United States not on active duty;

"(3) five general officers of the Army Reserve not on active duty; and

"(4) the Chief of Army Reserve and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or their designees.

"(c) The members of the General Staff Committee shall select the Chairman from among the members on the General Staff Committee not on active duty.

"(d) A majority of the members of the General Staff Committee shall act whenever matters affecting both the Army National Guard of the United States and Army Re-

serve are being considered. However, when any matter solely affecting one of the reserve components of the Army is being considered, it shall be acted upon by the Committee on Army National Guard Policy or the Committee on Army Reserve Policy, as appropriate.

"(e) The Committee on Army National Guard Policy consists of the members of the General Staff Committee other than the Army Reserve members.

"(f) The Committee on Army Reserve Policy consists of the members of the General Staff Committee other than the Army National Guard members.

"(g) Membership on the General Staff Committee is determined by the Secretary of the Army and is for a minimum period of three years. The Secretary of the Army, when appointing new members, shall insure that each section of the General Staff Committee will, at all times, have two or more members with more than one year of continuous service on the Committee.

"(h) There shall be not less than 10 officers of the Army National Guard of the United States and the Army Reserve on duty with the Army General Staff, one-half of whom shall be from each of those components. These officers shall be considered as additional members of the Army General Staff while on that duty."

(18) A new section 3226 is added after section 3225 as follows:

"§ 3226. Reserve components of Army: Selected Reserve

"(a) The reserve components of the Army shall be organized to include units in the Selected Reserve with an average annual strength in members of not less than—

"(1) 260,000 for the Army Reserve; and

"(2) 380,000 for the Army National Guard of the United States.

These strengths include those members ordered, without their consent, to active duty with their units.

"(b) The organization and structure of units in the Selected Reserve shall be as approved by the Secretary of Defense and be based upon recommendations of the Chief of Staff of the Army that are approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in accordance with contingency and war plans.

"(c) Members of the reserve components of the Army assigned to units in the Selected Reserve are required to perform the training prescribed in section 270(a) (1) of this title or section 502(a) of title 32."

(19) The following new item inserted in the analysis of chapter 331:

"3226. Reserve components of Army: Selected Reserve."

(20) A new section 5413a is added after section 5413 as follows:

"§ 5413a. Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve: Selected Reserve

"(a) The Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve shall be organized to include units and Reserves in the Selected Reserve with an average annual strength in members of not less than—

"(1) 126,000 for the Naval Reserve; and

"(2) 48,000 for the Marine Corps Reserve.

"(b) The organization and structure of units, and the organization of Reserves, in the Selected Reserve of the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve shall be as approved by the Secretary of Defense and be based upon recommendations of the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, as the case may be, that are approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in accordance with contingency and war plans.

"(c) Units and Reserves in the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve designated as comprising the Selected Reserve of those reserve components shall be maintained at an annual average strength in members of not less than—

"(1) 126,000 for the Naval Reserve; and

"(2) 48,000 for the Marine Corps Reserve.

These strengths include those members ordered, without their consent, to active duty with their units.

"(d) Members of the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve assigned to units in the Selected Reserve are required to perform the training prescribed in section 270(a) (1) of this title."

(21) The following new item is inserted in the analysis of chapter 531:

"5413a. Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve: Selected Reserve."

(22) A new section 8019 is added as follows:

"§ 8019. Office of Air Force Reserve: appointment of Chief, Deputy Chief, and acting chief; functions; policies, and regulations for government of Air Force Reserve

"(a) There is in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force an Office of Air Force Reserve which is headed by a chief who has direct access to the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff, and is the principal adviser to the Chief of Staff, on matters relating to the Air Force Reserve. The Office of Air Force Reserve includes a general counsel, a comptroller, and other personnel necessary to discharge its statutory responsibilities. It is—

"(1) the supervisory and operating agency of the Department of the Air Force for the Air Force Reserve;

"(2) the Department of the Air Force agency responsible for coordination of communication between the Department of the Air Force and its subordinate commands on matters relating to the Air Force Reserve; and

"(3) responsible for preserving and maintaining the integrity of the unit and command structure of the Air Force Reserve as a separate and distinct part of the structure of the Air Force.

"(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint the Chief of Air Force Reserve from officers of the Air Force Reserve not on active duty, or on active duty under section 265 of this title, who—

"(1) have had at least 10 years of commissioned service in the Air Force;

"(2) are in grade of brigadier general and above; and

"(3) have been recommended by the Secretary of the Air Force from a list containing the names of not less than three, or more than five, officers submitted by the Air Staff Committee on Air Force Reserve Policy.

"(c) The Chief of Air Force Reserve holds office for four years, but may be removed for cause at any time. He is eligible to succeed himself. If he holds a lower reserve grade, he shall be appointed in the grade of major general for service in the Air Force Reserve.

"(d) There is a Deputy Chief of Air Force Reserve. He shall be nominated by the Chief of Air Force Reserve and appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force from officers of the Air Force Reserve not on active duty, or on active duty under section 265 of this title, who meet the requirements prescribed in subsection (b) (1) and are in the grade of colonel or above. If he holds a lower reserve grade, he shall be appointed in the grade of brigadier general for service in the Air Force Reserve. He serves in that position for four years and is eligible for appointment as Chief of Air Force Reserve without a break in active service.

"(e) If the Chief of Air Force Reserve is unable, because of disability, to perform the functions of his office, or if that office is vacant, the Deputy Chief, or the senior officer of the Air Force Reserve on duty in the Office

of Air Force Reserve, shall act as its chief until the disability ceases or a successor is appointed."

(23) The following new item is added to the analysis of chapter 803:

"8019. Office of Air Force Reserve: appointment of Chief, Deputy Chief, and acting chief; functions, policies, and regulations for government of Air Force Reserve."

(24) The text of section 8033 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is in the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force an Air Staff Committee on Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Policy which shall review and comment upon each proposed change in Air Force policy or regulation directly affecting the reserve components of the Air Force prior to its final submission to the Chief of Staff, and the Assistant Secretary responsible for reserve affairs, for approval. The recommendations of the Air Staff Committee shall accompany any proposed change in policy or regulation, or both, when it is acted upon by the Chief of Staff and the Assistant Secretary responsible for reserve affairs.

"(b) The Air Staff Committee consists of—
 "(1) five general officers of the Regular Air Force on duty with the Air Staff;

"(2) five general officers of the Air National Guard of the United States not on active duty;

"(3) five general officers of the Air Force Reserve not on active duty; and

"(4) the Chief of Air Force Reserve and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or their designees.

"(c) The members of the Air Staff Committee shall select the Chairman from among the members on the Air Staff Committee not on active duty.

"(d) A majority of the members of the Air Staff Committee shall act whenever matters affecting both the Air National Guard of the United States and Air Force Reserve are being considered. However, when any matter solely affecting one of the Air Force Reserve components is being considered, it shall be acted upon by the Committee on Air National Guard Policy or the Committee on Air Force Reserve Policy, as appropriate.

"(e) The Committee on Air National Guard Policy consists of the members of the Air Staff Committee other than the Air Force Reserve members.

"(f) The Committee on Air Force Reserve Policy consists of the members of the Air Staff Committee other than the Air National Guard members.

"(g) Membership on the Air Staff Committee is determined by the Secretary of the Air Force and is for a minimum period of three years. The Secretary of the Air Force, when appointing new members, shall insure that each section of the Air Staff Committee will, at all times, have two or more members with more than one year of continuous service on the Committee.

"(h) There shall be not less than 10 officers of the Air National Guard of the United States and the Air Force Reserve on duty with the Air Staff, one-half of whom shall be from each of those components. These officers shall be considered as additional members of the Air Staff while on that duty."

(25) A new section 8226 is added after section 8225 as follows:

"§ 8226. Reserve components of Air Force: Selected Reserve

"(a) The reserve components of the Air Force shall be organized to include units and Reserves in the Selected Reserve with an average annual strength in members of not less than—

"(1) 51,000 for the Air Force Reserve; and
 "(2) 80,000 for the Air National Guard of the United States.

These strengths include those members ordered, without their consent, to active duty with their units.

"(b) The organization and structure of units in the Selected Reserve shall be approved by the Secretary of Defense and be based upon recommendations of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force that are approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in accordance with contingency and war plans.

"(c) Members of the reserve components of the Air Force assigned to units in the Selected Reserve are required to perform the training prescribed in section 270(a)(1) of this title or section 502(a) of title 32."

(26) The following new item is inserted in the analysis of chapter 831:

"8226. Reserve components of Air Force: Selected Reserve."

Sec. 102. Title 14, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) A new section 752b is added after section 752a as follows:

"§ 752b. Coast Guard Reserve: Selected Reserve

"(a) The Coast Guard Reserve shall be organized to include units and Reserves in the Selected Reserve, with an average annual strength in members of not less than 17,000.

"(b) The organization and structure of units, and the organization of Reserves, in the Selected Reserve of the Coast Guard Reserve shall be based on recommendations of the Commandant of the Coast Guard that are approved by the Secretary in accordance with mobilization requirements.

"(c) Members of the Coast Guard Reserve assigned to units in the Selected Reserve are required to perform the training prescribed in section 270(a)(1) of title 10."

(2) The following new item is inserted in the analysis of chapter 21:

"752b. Coast Guard Reserve: Selected Reserve."

Sec. 103. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The text of section 3212 is amended to read as follows:

"The authorized strength in grade as prescribed by or under this chapter is automatically increased to the minimum extent necessary and to give effect to each appointment—

"(1) in a regular grade under section 541, 1211(a), 3036, 3298, 3299, 3304, or 4353 of this title; or

"(2) in a reserve grade, not above lieutenant colonel, under section 1211(a), 3365(a), 3366, 3383, or 3385 of this title, to fill prescribed mobilization or active duty requirements.

An authorized strength so increased is increased for no other purpose. While he holds that grade the officer whose appointment caused the increase is counted for the purpose of determining when appointments not authorized by clauses (1) and (2) may be made."

(2) Section 3383(e) is repealed.

(3) The text of section 8212 is amended to read as follows:

"The authorized strength in grade as prescribed by or under this chapter is automatically increased to the minimum extent necessary and to give effect to each appointment—

"(1) in a regular grade under section 541, 1211(a), 8298, 8299, or 9353 of this title; or

"(2) in a reserve grade, not above lieutenant colonel, under section 1211(a), 8365 (a) and (c), 8366 (a) and (d), 8370 (a) or (c), 8372(b), 8374, 8375, 8376, 8380, or 8381 of this title, to fill prescribed mobilization or active duty requirements.

An authorized strength so increased is increased for no other purpose. While he holds that grade the officer whose appointment caused the increase is counted for the purpose of determining when appointments not

authorized by clauses (1) and (2) may be made."

Sec. 104. Section 404(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (2), striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in place thereof the word "and", and adding the following new clause:

"(4) when away from home to perform duty, including duty to be performed by a member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States in his status as a member of the National Guard, for which he is entitled to, or has waived, pay under this title."

Sec. 105. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may, without the consent of the member concerned, and on certifying the necessity therefor to the Congress, order to active duty any member of the Ready Reserve of an armed force who—

(1) is not assigned to, or participating satisfactorily in, a unit in the Selected Reserve, and

(2) has not fulfilled his statutory reserve obligation, and

(3) has not served on active duty or active duty for training for a total of twenty-four months.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until June 30, 1968, the President may, without the consent of the member concerned, and on certifying the necessity therefor to the Congress, order to active duty any member of the Ready Reserve of an armed force who had become a member of a reserve component prior to July 1, 1966; and who

(1) has not served on active duty or active duty for training for a period of one hundred and twenty days or more, and

(2) has not fulfilled his statutory reserve military obligation.

(c) A member ordered to active duty under this section may be required to serve on active duty until his total service on active duty or active duty for training equals twenty-four months. If the enlistment or period of military service of a member of the Ready Reserve ordered to active duty under subsections (a) or (b) of this section would expire before he has served the required period of active duty prescribed herein, his enlistment or period of military service may be extended until that service on active duty has been completed.

(d) In order to achieve fair treatment as between members in the Ready Reserve who are being considered for active duty under this section, appropriate consideration shall be given to—

(1) family responsibilities; and

(2) employment necessary to maintain the national health, safety, or interest.

Sec. 106. Title 32, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 101(1) is amended by adding the following new sentence at the end: "However, for purposes of this title and other laws relating to the militia, the National Guard, the Army National Guard of the United States, and the Air National Guard of the United States, 'Territory' includes the Virgin Islands."

(2) Section 305 is amended—

(A) by striking out "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), only male persons" and inserting in place thereof "Persons";

(B) by striking out subsection (b).

(3) The last sentence of section 502(b) is amended to read as follows: "However, to have a series of formations credited as an assembly for drill and instruction, all parts of the unit must be included in the series within 30 consecutive days."

Sec. 107. Section 6(c)(2)(A) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as

amended, is amended by inserting the words "or the equivalent training prescribed under section 511(d) of title 10, United States Code," after the words "four consecutive months" in the second sentence thereof.

SEC. 108. The provisions of title I of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the month following enactment with the exception of clauses 18, 20, and 25 of section 101, and clause 1 of section 102 which will become effective on July 1, 1967.

TITLE II—NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "National Guard Technicians Benefits Act".

SEC. 202. Title 32, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 709 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 709. Technicians: employment, use, status
 "(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, persons may be employed in—

"(1) the administration and training of the National Guard;

"(2) the maintenance and repair of supplies issued to the National Guard or the armed forces; and

"(3) the performance of such other duties as the Secretary concerned may prescribe.

"(b) Except as prescribed by the Secretary concerned, a technician employed under subsection (a) shall, while so employed, be a member of the National Guard and hold the military grade specified by the Secretary concerned for that position.

"(c) The Secretary concerned shall designate the adjutants general referred to in section 314 of this title, or other appropriate persons, to employ the technicians authorized by this section.

"(d) A technician employed under subsection (a) is an employee of the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force, as the case may be, and an employee of the United States. However, a position authorized by this section is outside the competitive civil service if the technician employed therein is required under subsection (b) to be a member of the National Guard.

"(e) Notwithstanding sections 673c and 913 of title 5 or any other provision of law, the Secretary concerned may, in the case of technicians assigned to perform operational duties at air defense sites—

"(1) prescribe the hours of duties;

"(2) fix the rates of basic compensation; and

"(3) fix the rates of additional compensation;

to reflect unusual tours of duty, irregular additional duty, and work on days that are ordinarily nonworkdays. Additional compensation under this subsection may be fixed on an annual basis, but no rate of additional compensation on an annual basis may exceed 25 percent of the rate of basic compensation.

"(f) The limitation on the number of permanent employees prescribed by section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended (5 U.S.C. 43 note), is not applicable to technicians employed under this section."

(2) The analysis of chapter 7 is amended by striking out the following item:

"709. Caretakers and clerks."

and inserting in place thereof the following item:

"709. Technicians: employment, use, status."

(3) Section 715(a) is amended by striking out "caused by a person employed under section 709 of this title acting within the scope of his employment;"

SEC. 203. (a) A claim accrued under section 715 of title 32, United States Code, be-

fore the effective date of title II of this Act by reason of the act or omission of a person employed under section 709 of title 32, United States Code, may, if otherwise allowable, be settled and paid under section 715 of title 32, United States Code.

(b) Notwithstanding any law, rule, regulation, or decision to the contrary, the positions of persons employed under section 709 of title 32, United States Code, existing on the day before the effective date of title II of this Act, and the persons holding those positions on that day, shall, on and after that effective date, be considered to be positions in and employees of the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force, as the case may be, to the same extent as other positions in and employees of the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force. Such positions shall be outside the competitive civil service, if, as a condition of employment, the persons employed therein were, on the day before the effective date of title II of this Act, required to be members of the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard.

(c) All satisfactory service under section 709 of title 32, United States Code, or prior corresponding provision of law before the effective date of title II of this Act shall be included and credited in the determination of length of service for the purposes of leave, veteran's preference, group life and health insurance, seniority, tenure, training, status, and other rights and benefits of employees of the United States. The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, or their designees, shall certify to the Government authority concerned the amount of satisfactory service to be included and credited for the purpose of employment rights and benefits. Such Government authority is authorized and directed to accept that certification.

(d) Annual leave and sick leave to which a technician was entitled on the day before the conversion of his position, as provided in section 204 of this Act, shall be credited to him in his new position.

SEC. 204. (a) The first sentence of section 3(a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2253(a)), is amended to read as follows: "An employee's service for the purpose of this Act includes service as (1) a substitute in the postal field service, or (2) a person employed under section 709 of title 32, United States Code, or any prior corresponding provision of law, and shall be credited from the date of original employment to the date of the separation upon which title to annuity is based in the civilian service of the Government."

(b) Notwithstanding section 709(d) of title 32, United States Code, a person who, on the date of enactment of title II of this Act, is employed under section 709 of title 32, United States Code, and is covered by an employee retirement system of, or plan sponsored by, a State or Puerto Rico, may elect, not later than the effective date of title II of this Act, not to be covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.), and with the consent of the State concerned or Puerto Rico, to remain covered by the employee retirement system of, or plan sponsored by, that State or Puerto Rico. Unless such an election, together with a statement of approval by the State concerned or Puerto Rico, is filed with the United States Civil Service Commission on or before the effective date of title II of this Act, the person concerned is covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act as of that date. In the case of any person who files a valid election under this subsection to remain covered by an employee retirement system of, or plan sponsored by, a State or Puerto Rico, the United States may pay the

amount of the employer's contributions to that system or plan that become due for periods beginning on or after the effective date of title II of this Act. However, the payment by the United States, including any contribution that may be made by the United States toward the employer's tax imposed by section 3111(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended (26 U.S.C. 3111(a)), may not exceed the payment which the United States would otherwise make on behalf of the person to the civil service retirement and disability fund under section 4(a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2254(a)). The service under section 709 of title 32, United States Code, or prior corresponding provision of law, of a person who has made an election to remain covered by the employee retirement system of, or plan sponsored by, a State or Puerto Rico, shall not be creditable toward eligibility for or amount of annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended.

SEC. 205. The fourth sentence of section 218(b)(5) of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 418(b)(5)), is amended to read as follows: "Persons employed under section 709 of title 32, United States Code, who elected under section 204(b) of the Act enacting this amended sentence to remain covered by an employee retirement system of, or plan sponsored by, a State, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be employees of the State and (notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph), shall be deemed to be a separate coverage group."

SEC. 206. (a) Except as provided in section 709(e) of title 32, United States Code, the Secretary concerned shall fix the rate of basic compensation of positions existing on the date of enactment of title II of this Act in accordance with the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or under the appropriate prevailing rate schedule in accordance with section 202(7) of that Act (5 U.S.C. 1082(7)), as applicable. In fixing such rate:

(1) If the technician is receiving a rate of basic compensation which is less than the minimum rate of the appropriate grade of the General Schedule, or which is less than the minimum rate of the appropriate grade or compensation level of the appropriate prevailing rate schedule, as applicable, in which his position is placed, his basic compensation shall be increased to that minimum rate.

(2) If the technician is receiving a rate of basic compensation which is equal to a rate of the appropriate grade of the General Schedule, or which is equal to a rate of the appropriate grade or compensation level under the appropriate prevailing rate schedule, as applicable, in which his position is placed, he shall receive basic compensation at that rate of the General Schedule, or at that rate under the prevailing rate schedule, if applicable.

(3) If the technician is receiving a rate of basic compensation which is between two rates of the appropriate grade of the General Schedule, or which is between two rates of the appropriate grade or compensation level under the appropriate prevailing rate schedule, as applicable, in which his position is placed, he shall receive basic compensation at the higher of those two rates under the General Schedule or appropriate prevailing rate schedule, as applicable.

(4) If the technician is receiving a rate of basic compensation which is in excess of the maximum rate of the appropriate grade of the General Schedule, or which is in excess of the maximum rate of the appropriate grade or compensation level of the appropriate prevailing rate schedule, as applicable, in which his position is placed, he shall con-

time to receive basic compensation without change in rate until—

(A) he leaves that position, or
(B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate,

but, when any such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in the manner provided by applicable law and regulation.

(b) The conversion of positions and employees to appropriate grades of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the initial adjustment of rates of basic compensation of those positions and technicians, provided for by title II of this Act, shall not be considered to be transfers or promotions within the meaning of section 802(b) of that Act (5 U.S.C. 1132(b)) and the regulations issued thereunder.

(c) Each technician on the effective date of title II of this Act whose position is converted to the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or to the appropriate prevailing rate schedule, as applicable, who prior to the initial adjustment of his rate of basic compensation under subsection (a) of this section, has earned, but has not been credited with, an increase in that rate, shall be granted credit for such increase before his rate of basic compensation is initially adjusted under that subsection.

(d) Each technician on the effective date of title II of this Act whose position is so converted shall be granted credit, for purposes of his first step increase under such General Schedule or prevailing rate schedule, for all satisfactory service performed by him since his last increase in compensation prior to the initial adjustment of his rate of basic compensation under subsection (a) of this section.

(e) An increase in rate of basic compensation by reason of the enactment of subsection (a) of this section shall not be considered to be an equivalent increase with respect to step increases for technicians whose positions are converted to the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or the appropriate prevailing rate schedule under authority of this section.

Sec. 207. This title becomes effective July 1, 1967, except that no deductions or withholding from salary which result therefrom shall commence before the first day of the first pay period that begins on or after July 1, 1967. This title shall be administered under uniform regulations jointly prescribed by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force and approved by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee amendment be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HÉBERT

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HÉBERT: On page 51, delete the sentence beginning on line 19 and ending on line 23, and substitute the following:

"Each person enlisted under this subsection shall perform an initial period of active duty for training of not less than four

months to commence within one hundred and eighty days after the date of that enlistment."

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is merely to correct a printer's error in the bill. It is just a technical amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NEDZI

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NEDZI: On page 63, line 3, after "(1)" strike out "260,000" and insert in lieu thereof "200,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I have previously explained what the object of my amendment is. This is to bring the bill in conformity with the testimony and evidence as presented to the Committee on Armed Services with respect to the need for Reserve Forces at this time. It does nothing to the President's right to call up the Reserve. It does nothing to the National Guard technicians portion of the bill. It merely reduces the total number of Reserves by 60,000.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do so with the one comment that it is very hard to understand how the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] refuses to accept a figure without testimony but submits his own figure without testimony.

I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FASCELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17195) to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve Components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1009, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill in this form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NEDZI moves to recommit the bill H.R. 17195 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to strike out on page 63, line 3, "260,000" and insert "200,000" in lieu thereof, and report the same back to the House forthwith.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 332, nays 6, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

YEAS—332

Abbott	Broyhill, Va.	de la Garza
Adair	Buchanan	Delaney
Addabbo	Burke	Derwinski
Anderson, Ill.	Burleson	Devine
Andrews,	Burton, Utah	Diggs
George W.	Byrne, Pa.	Dingell
Andrews,	Byrnes, Wis.	Dole
N. Dak.	Cabell	Donohue
Annunzio	Cahill	Dorn
Arends	Carey	Dow
Ashbrook	Casey	Dowdy
Ashley	Cederberg	Downing
Ashmore	Chamberlain	Dulski
Ayres	Chelf	Duncan, Tenn.
Bandstra	Ciancy	Dwyer
Baring	Clark	Edwards, Ala.
Bates	Clausen,	Erlenborn
Battin	Don H.	Everett
Beckworth	Clawson, Del	Farnum
Belcher	Cleveland	Fasell
Bell	Clevenger	Feighan
Bennett	Cohelan	Findley
Berry	Collier	Fino
Betts	Colmer	Flynt
Blatnik	Conable	Fogarty
Boggs	Cooley	Foley
Boland	Corbett	Ford, Gerald R.
Bolton	Cramer	Ford,
Bow	Culver	William D.
Brademas	Cunningham	Fountain
Bray	Curtin	Fraser
Brook	Curtis	Frellinghuysen
Brooks	Daddario	Friedel
Broomfield	Dague	Fulton, Pa.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Daniels	Fulton, Tenn.
Broyhill, N.C.	Davis, Wis.	Fuqua
	Dawson	Gathings

Gettys
Giaino
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Hollifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kornegay
Krebs
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory

McCulloch
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
Olson, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.

Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudsbush
Roush
Satterfield
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson
Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—6

Burton, Calif.
Kastenmeier

Kupferman
Race

Ryan
Stalbaum

NOT VOTING—94

Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Anderson,
Tenn.
Andrews,
Glenn
Aspinall
Barrett
Bingham
Bolling
Brown, Calif.
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carter
Celler
Conte
Conyers

Corman
Craley
Davis, Ga.
Dent
Denton
Dickinson
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Fisher
Flood

Gallagher
Garmatz
Gray
Hagan, Ga.
Hanna
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Holland
Hungate
Jacobs
Kee
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Leggett
McDade
McEwen

McMillan
Mackay
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Miller
Moeller
Morrison
Moss
Murray
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Patman

Pool
Purcell
Quillen
Reinecke
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Tex.
Roncallo
Rooney, Pa.
Roybal
Rumsfeld
St Germain
St. Onge
Scott

Senner
Slack
Smith, Va.
Stratton
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Udall
Ullman
Walker, Miss.
Watts
Willis
Wilson, Bob

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Miller with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Dyal with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Willis with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Roncallo with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Rogers of Texas.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Cameron.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Mackay with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Edmondson.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. O'Hara of Michigan.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Rivers of Alaska.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Callan with Mr. Scott.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Ullman.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Flood.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Craley.

Mr. DIGGS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce another milestone in the work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

Today, the distinguished cochairman of the joint committee, Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, has introduced in the other body the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966. My colleague and ranking Republican member of the joint committee, Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, is introducing virtually identical legislation in the House of Representatives today. This gives me the occasion to report to the House on the status of this highly important work.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress filed its final report on July 28, 1966. The report contained over 100 separate individual recommendations for improvements of congressional machinery. It was the product of 17 months of effort—including 5 months of hearings during which 191 witnesses, including more than 100 Members of Congress, presented their views on congressional reform. The report of this 12-member, bipartisan joint committee was unanimous.

On August 18, I introduced H.R. 17138 incorporating the recommendations of the joint committee. Under Senate procedures, it was necessary for our Senate colleagues on the joint committee to ask for a resolution giving them legislative authority as a special committee to report an omnibus reorganization bill. This resolution—Senate Resolution 293—was reported favorably by the Senate Rules and Administration Committee and unanimously agreed to by the Senate on August 26. However, the Senate Rules Committee amended the resolution to direct the special committee to receive the views of chairmen and ranking minority members of the standing committees of the Senate before reporting the bill.

The special committee immediately commenced hearings for appearances by chairmen and ranking minority members as provided by the resolution. Those hearings have been concluded and some modifications made in the language of the bill to clarify the joint committee's position on questions raised in this testimony. The committee met last Monday to approve the bill and its report.

Today, Senator MONRONEY requested the Senate leadership to give every possible consideration to calling the bill up

for floor action as quickly as possible. He pointed out that this legislation was also pending in the House of Representatives and the need for both Houses to work their will on the measure prior to adjournment. I am most hopeful that it will be possible to do so.

This past week I sent many of you copies of editorials which had appeared in newspapers, large and small, scattered over the country. This press comment indicates a clear public awareness of the issues of congressional reform. I believe the American people expect us to take action this session—and that they have a right to expect us to. I urge the support of every Member of the House in the consideration and passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966.

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS HAS ASSURED CONSERVATION PROGRESS

MR. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MR. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, in these waning days of the great conservation-minded 89th Congress tribute is due those who have worked to bring new life to the land and water resources of the Nation.

The 89th has written an imposing record of legislation aimed at preserving this rich and vital heritage. The Appalachian Regional Development Act, the Rural Water and Sanitation Facilities Act, the Water Resources Planning Act, the Water Quality Act, among many other pieces of legislation relating to land and water conservation and development, and rural life improvement, have come from the Halls of this Congress. I am indeed proud to have had a part in these historical determinations.

But the accomplishments at the national level have their roots in home soil. Programs authorized under congressional acts can be successful only with firm local support, participation, and determination. I am satisfied that we have a firm base of operations to assure the success of the soil and water conservation and development effort in Ohio.

The nearly 62,000 rural land owners and operators who are soil conservation district cooperators in the State attest to it. So does the fact that all the farms in the State, embracing 25 million acres of land, are in organized soil conservation districts.

The wide base of support for soil and water resource conservation in Ohio is further indicated in the State appropriation of nearly half a million dollars in support of this effort for fiscal year 1966; and in the value of local contributions to help carry out the program of soil conservation districts amounting to \$223,000 in fiscal 1966.

Eighteen business enterprises were established or expanded their operations

in Ohio last year as a result of soil and water conservation work.

More than 4,800 nonfarm landowners and operators received technical assistance through soil conservation districts during fiscal year 1965 in rural fringe developments serving expanding urban areas.

I believe these are important facts to consider as we prepare to close the book on the 89th Congress. We can, I think, be satisfied that we have strengthened the base from which future programs of soil and water conservation may be launched, as required in the national interest.

Broad and devoted interest in the conservation of our land and water resources is essential to national progress and prosperity. Recognition of this fact is reflected in the support Congress has consistently given to wise conservation programs, and indeed, in the provision of new programs as the need for them has been identified. It is reflected in the support given by State and local governments, and by the initiative and participation at the local level where it counts most.

MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE BY THE BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS OF THE U.S.A.

MR. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MR. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks is one of the great fraternal organizations in our country. I am proud of the fact that I have been a member for many years.

The National Memorial and Publication Commission has set forth the following major contributions to the national defense that have been made during World War I, World War II, the Korean war, and now in Vietnam. This record is one for which every person in our country should be grateful:

MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE BY THE BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS OF THE U.S.A.

WORLD WAR I

The Grand Lodge in July 1917 created a War Relief Commission to direct activities on behalf of the Nation's war effort, and appropriated \$1,000,000 to finance these activities. Another million dollars was appropriated in 1918.

The War Commission organized and equipped the first two base hospitals to reach the battle area in France. Unit No. 41 was staffed by faculty and alumni of the University of Virginia and Unit No. 46 was staffed by faculty and alumni of the University of Oregon.

The Commission constructed a 700-bed Reconstruction Hospital at Boston to care for returned wounded, and gave it to the Government in 1918. It was the first such hospital in the United States.

The Commission made 40,000 loans to finance vocational rehabilitation education for disabled veterans ineligible for help under the Government's program, or awaiting approval of their applications. All loans were repaid save for a few cases where death or other circumstances prevented it.

WORLD WAR II

The Elks National Defense Commission and its successor, the Elks War Commission, directed the Order's efforts from July, 1940 to the end of hostilities, when responsibility for cooperation with the National Defense was given to the Elks National Service Commission.

From 1940 to 1946 the Grand Lodge spent \$1,500,000 on programs in support of the Nation's defense, and Subordinate Lodges spent hundreds of thousands of dollars more. Some of the Order's contributions during this period:

A composite portrait of Uncle Sam was commissioned and presented to President Roosevelt for use as a patriotic poster. The painting also was the basis for an essay contest conducted among high school students on the subject, "What Uncle Sam Means to Me".

To aid recruitment of flying cadets for the Army, more than 400 Lodges conducted refresher courses that enabled thousands of young men to qualify for training.

In 1942, the Adjutant General of the Army asked the Order to help recruit 45,000 men for Air Corps ground crews. Community recruitment programs organized by Subordinate Lodges were so successful that in a short time the Adjutant General notified the War Commission that 97,000 men had been recruited.

As a result of the Order's successful recruiting efforts for the Army, the Secretary of the Navy asked for our help in recruiting for the Naval Air Corps, and again our Subordinate Lodges met the need.

When the Army and Navy desperately needed construction specialists for the Engineers and Seabees, the Services decided on a joint recruitment campaign and requested the help of the Elks, the only civilian organization to take part in the program. So successful were our Lodge's efforts that the number of men needed was obtained three months ahead of schedule.

The Order operated 155 fraternal centers adjacent to training camps and stations offering wholesome entertainment, relaxation, recreation and refreshments to military personnel. Over a million Allied servicemen and women were guests of the center in New York City alone.

Thousands of gift boxes containing smoker's supplies, candy, shaving equipment, handkerchiefs and other items were sent to Elks and their buddies in the Armed Forces.

Elks lodges collected and donated to the Merchant Marine several hundred thousand books.

Thousands of pairs of slippers were produced for the Elks and supplied to hospitalized servicemen.

The Order sponsored a "Write 'em A Letter" campaign to maintain communications between home and men in the Armed Forces and sustain morale. To promote the campaign, a cartoon contest was conducted among members of the Armed Forces. Winner of second prize was Private Bill Mauldin, 45th Division.

Elks sent millions of cigarettes and huge quantities of other smoking materials to our Armed Forces. In one year alone, nearly 16,000,000 cigarettes and more than 700,000 packages of tobacco were sent.

POSTWAR PERIOD

The Order of Elks has pledged that so long as there is a disabled veteran in a hospital, they will not forget him. That pledge

is being redeemed by a year round program of recreation and entertainment in every veterans' hospital in the country.

In addition, Elks collect and distribute to veterans' hospitals hides and leather, clocks, watches and electrical equipment for use by patients in occupational therapy.

In 1951, the Secretary of Defense appealed to the Order of Elks to help procure blood desperately needed by our wounded in Korea. Within a few months, our Lodges procured nearly 600,000 pints of blood.

In 1965, the Elks National Service Commission began a "Letters from Home" campaign on behalf of our fighting men in South Viet Nam. Elks Lodges were asked to develop and distribute lists of names of men from their community in Viet Nam and ask all citizens to write them letters of understanding of our purpose in Viet Nam and support for them.

LIFE INSURANCE FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the present life insurance plan for members of our Armed Forces is inadequate and antiquated.

Our Government first instituted a life insurance plan in 1917, when this Nation entered World War I. It provided a maximum of \$10,000 coverage for a member of the Armed Forces.

The Government has extended and continued to the present the practice of making life insurance available to members of our Armed Forces at reduced rates. However, the \$10,000 maximum that was established in 1917 is still the limit today.

This is unfair. We are not living today by 1917 standards. I believe that it is wrong to ask a person to serve his nation and then for his nation to not be willing to provide him with realistic benefits.

I have today introduced a bill that would increase the maximum life insurance limits to \$25,000. This is the amount that today would equal the buying power of \$10,000 in 1917 dollars. In other words, adjusting \$10,000 of 1917 dollars to the Consumer Price Index as of 1966 equals \$25,000.

This bill would guarantee our soldiers what they were originally given 49 years ago. To do anything to the contrary would be grossly unfair.

This bill will not put the Government in the insurance business. The Government will contract with insurance companies for group life insurance policies, and soldier and the Government will share the premiums, as is now the case.

Presently the cost for \$10,000 of life insurance is \$2 per month. I am hopeful that the revised premiums will continue to be as economical for the amount of insurance received.

It should be noted that this figure of \$2 per month for \$10,000 represents a

premium equivalent to what the average serviceman would be paying in civilian life for life insurance, without the war risk premium. Naturally, as the armed services are a very large group, the Government can obtain very low rates. The Government then pays the amount of the premium that would normally be added on due to the war risk dangers. This risk is what the Government is asking the individual to expose himself to, and it is very fair and logical that the Government should pay this part of the premium.

My bill will achieve five purposes that will benefit the serviceman and his dependents.

First, it will raise the present limit to \$25,000. This will be available to all members of the armed services, regardless of rank or years of service.

Second, nothing is being forced on anyone. The serviceman may choose to insure himself for lesser amounts in multiples of \$5,000, or he may choose not to insure himself at all. This is strictly the individual's choice.

Third, the individual may choose to raise his limits at any time, if he has previously chosen a reduced coverage. Only a routine physical examination will be required. Many servicemen may choose to do this prior to being assigned overseas. If the individual at one time chooses to waive insurance altogether, he may still elect at any time to insure himself. This means that the serviceman and his dependents will not be made to suffer for a mistake in judgment, or due to circumstances beyond his control, such as reassignment.

Fourth, all persons entering the service will have automatic \$25,000 coverage upon going on duty, unless they specify otherwise.

Fifth, the life insurance will be convertible upon leaving the service, and will be with the same private insurance company that the individual had his policy with when he was in the service.

There is no question that group life insurance for our servicemen is necessary. President Eisenhower, in 1959, drawing on his extensive experience with the military, stated that the basic idea of group life insurance for servicemen was a "comprehensive, and assured system of benefits."

My bill, Mr. Speaker, therefore guarantees our servicemen the equivalent of what was fair back in 1917. The proposal, if anything, is overly conservative. It does not force anyone to buy life insurance, but gives him the choice to do so.

I urge my fellow Members of Congress to carefully consider the merits of my bill. I am certain that after studying this matter, swift approval will be given to it. This measure is very necessary.

TWO AND ONE-HALF BILLION DOLLARS GAMBLER ON FOREIGN LOTTERIES

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, this year I would like to once again bring to the attention of the Members of this Congress a report on gross receipts and net incomes from government-run lotteries around the world. These nations have wisely discovered that lotteries can make gambling moneys work for, rather than against, the people. In all of these countries, the gambling spirit of its people is legally recognized and capitalized on by its governments.

Unfortunately, we, in the United States, stand virtually alone among the nations of the world in our hypocrisy in refusing to recognize and accept the wisdom and advantages of a national lottery. And the list of foreign nations with lotteries gets longer each year.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for our taxpayers to understand our Government's sanctimonious attitude about gambling when we know that gambling in this country is a \$100-billion-a-year tax-free monopoly which is and continues to be the chief source of revenue to the underworld crime syndicates.

If we had a Government-run lottery, like our Latin American, European, and Asian allies do with near unanimity, we would satisfy the American thirst to gamble while at the same time making the flow of billions of dollars now siphoned off by the underworld work instead for public welfare. I think we could expect an American lottery to bring in gross receipts of \$10 billion or so, with commensurate profits.

In 1965, the 88 foreign countries, listed below, took in gross receipts of almost \$2½ billion from its legally operated government lotteries. The total income to the governments came to over \$875 million which was used for hospitals, schools, housing, welfare, charity, science, medicare, public developments, and other worthwhile projects.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time that we showed similar wisdom and courage in this country? Is it not time that we removed the blinders and recognized the obvious—that the urge to gamble is a universal human trait that should be regulated and controlled for our own welfare and benefit?

Why can we not profit from the lucrative experience of these 88 foreign countries? I am waiting for us to have the guts to face up to the fiscal facts of life and capitalize on the normal gambling spirit of our American people. I think we ought to profit nationally from the example of the State of New Hampshire, which has already started to enjoy the fiscal advantages of a government-run lottery.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to list the 88 foreign countries which recognize and accept the fact that gambling is a fact of life and should be made to work for the public good rather than against it:

Country	Gross receipts	Net income	Purpose used	Country	Gross receipts	Net income	Purpose used
1. Argentina.....	\$57,209,900	\$25,714,654	Public works and medical programs.	44. Jamaica.....	\$703,000	\$131,000	Hospitals.
2. Australia.....	98,506,900	30,069,885	Hospitals, charity, and Sydney Opera House.	45. Japan.....	15,719,000	5,572,000	Public works, schools, and hospitals.
3. Austria ¹	19,000,000	6,200,000	General purposes.	46. Jordan.....	75,270	11,696	Hospitals, junior clubs.
4. Belgium.....	24,700,000	7,600,000	Social welfare programs.	47. Laos ²			
5. Bolivia ³	789,355	347,146	Red Cross, public health, and welfare.	48. Lebanon.....	4,410,000	1,130,000	Schools and development.
6. Brazil.....	40,797,000	3,477,000	Public service projects, schools, hospitals, and housing.	49. Libya.....	1,092,000	318,000	Welfare projects.
7. British Honduras ⁴	3,500,000	90,000	Charities.	50. Liechtenstein.....	3,350,000	3,256	Government insurance.
8. Bulgaria.....	3,600,000	1,800,000	General purposes.	51. Luxembourg.....	1,590,000	418,000	Charity, welfare, and medicine.
9. Burma.....	6,000,000	2,400,000	Central Treasury.	52. Malaysia.....	16,533,000	4,035,000	Rural development program.
10. Cambodia ⁵	27,400,000	20,200,000	National budget.	53. Malta.....	1,359,523	294,199	General purposes.
11. Cameroon.....	279,000	110,000	Schools, hospitals.	54. Mexico ⁶	60,000,000	11,200,000	Health and welfare.
12. Central African Republic.....		200,000	National budget.	55. Morocco.....	2,410,000	600,000	Treasury.
13. Ceylon.....	3,656,000	1,546,000	Hospital fund.	56. Netherlands.....	12,819,890	1,105,000	General revenue.
14. Chile ⁷	13,500,000	2,407,000	Colleges, public health, and hospitals.	57. New Zealand.....	11,200,000	2,717,327	Aged, welfare, research, medicine.
15. Colombia.....	40,000,000	4,000,000	Homes for the poor and aged, and charity.	58. Nicaragua.....	7,535,714	1,211,094	Hospitals and social programs.
16. Costa Rica.....	11,771,000	3,907,000	Hospitals and mental institutions.	59. Nigeria.....	422,000	158,000	Medical services and development programs.
17. Cyprus.....	3,116,000	1,463,000	Development projects.	60. Norway.....	19,000,000	5,900,000	General funds.
18. Czechoslovakia ⁸	4,436,000	1,919,000	Hospitals, sports, and culture.	61. Panama.....	49,604,677	9,200,000	Hospitals and public assistance.
19. Denmark.....	8,894,000	888,000	General fund.	62. Pakistan ⁹	7,289,909	6,404,031	General development projects.
20. Dominican Republic.....	16,717,000	3,011,000	Social betterment and public works.	63. Paraguay.....	1,002,895	158,135	Child care and public health.
21. Ecuador.....	4,839,000	1,886,000	Social assistance, hospitals.	64. Peru.....	4,200,000		Hospital and medical care.
22. El Salvador.....	9,200,000	1,400,000	General fund.	65. Philippines.....	14,034,000	5,630,000	Hospitals, Red Cross, Boy and Girl Scouts.
23. England ¹⁰	260,000,000	146,000,000	Central Government expenses.	66. Poland ¹¹	3,932,000	933,143	Housing and culture.
24. Ethiopia.....	770,000	200,000	Welfare purposes.	67. Portugal.....	24,448,000	7,659,000	Treasury.
25. Finland.....	6,477,000	2,292,000	Science and fine arts, opera.	68. Puerto Rico.....	62,640,000	14,390,000	General fund.
26. France.....	138,000,000	43,000,000	General purposes.	69. Republic of China.....	5,784,000	3,062,000	General purposes.
27. Germany.....	597,000,000	199,000,000	Youth, sports activities, and health.	70. Republic of Congo.....	8,000	888	
28. Ghana.....	3,083,000	1,541,000	General fund.	71. Rumania.....	133,000,000		50 percent of income used for sports.
29. Gibraltar.....	2,006,200	397,600	Housing, education, social service.	72. Russia.....	90,000,000	45,000,000	Unknown.
30. Greece.....	43,248,000	9,301,000	Welfare agencies.	73. Sierra Leone.....	382,901	55,520	Development program.
31. Guatemala.....	2,365,000	567,000	National theater, arts, and culture.	74. Southern Rhodesia ¹²	4,580,000	745,000	
32. Guyana.....	261,668	75,000	Hospitals.	75. Spain.....	195,000,000	57,500,000	Red Cross and general budget.
33. Haiti.....	2,359,000	1,098,000	Education, social welfare, and assistance.	76. Sweden.....	62,223,000	34,748,000	Culture and artistic purposes.
34. Honduras.....	21,400,000	1,800,000	Schools, hospitals, and health centers.	77. Switzerland.....	3,600,000	1,050,000	Public building and transportation.
35. Hong Kong.....	1,516,000	910,000	Social welfare.	78. Syria.....	1,450,000	450,000	Damascus International Fair.
36. Hungary.....	53,000,000	17,000,000	General revenue.	79. Tanzania.....	328,387	171,428	Hospitals.
37. Iceland.....	1,548,000	309,662	Housing for elderly and research.	80. Thailand.....	39,000,000	7,500,000	General revenue.
38. Indonesia.....	102,000	69,000	Hospitals, students, and orphanages.	81. Togo.....	489,000	195,840	Redevelopment.
39. Iran.....	13,918,000	4,000,000	Hospitals and schools.	82. Turkey.....	9,900,000	4,300,000	General Treasury.
40. Iraq.....	2,452,000	961,000	Hospitals, welfare.	83. Tunisia ¹³			
41. Ireland.....	43,040,000	8,781,000	Hospitals.	84. Uganda ¹⁴	714,000	678,000	5-year plan.
42. Israel.....	35,000,000	11,000,000	Hospitals and schools.	85. Uruguay.....	6,715,000	2,046,803	General purposes.
43. Italy.....	166,000,000	84,000,000	Hospitals, orphanages, and education.	86. Venezuela ¹⁵	18,524,000	1,665,000	Social welfare.
				87. Vietnam.....	26,000,000	6,300,000	Housing and agriculture centers.
				88. Yugoslavia.....	8,023,262	1,818,370	Veterans, deaf and blind, Red Cross.
				Total.....	2,400,000,000	875,000,000	

¹ Austria, 1964 figures.² Bolivia, 1963 figures.³ British Honduras, 1964 figures.⁴ Cambodia, 1964 figures.⁵ Chile, 1964 figures.⁶ Czechoslovakia, 1964 figures.⁷ England, premium bond lottery.⁸ Laos—Laotian lottery disrupted by war and political situation.⁹ Mexico, 1963 figures.¹⁰ Pakistan, prize bond lottery, 1963 figures.¹¹ Poland, 1964 figures.¹² Southern Rhodesia, 1964 figures.¹³ Tunisia, lottery just getting underway.¹⁴ Uganda, prize bond lottery.¹⁵ Venezuela, 1964 figures.

ARMY IGNORES INTENT OF EXECUTIVE ORDER ON PURCHASE OF ANTHRACITE COAL

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in 1961 President John F. Kennedy directed that American anthracite coal should be bought to heat the U.S. Army installations in West Germany. Prior to this time the U.S. military installations in Europe bought European coal.

The purpose of this directive was twofold. It was meant to lessen the strain on our balance of payment and to be of some assistance to the hard-pressed

anthracite industry. Since 1962 the Army has purchased approximately 5½ million tons of coal for use in Europe. However, the procurement has not fulfilled the well-intended purposes of President Kennedy's directive.

On the one hand, Mr. Speaker, I believe a careful audit of the procurement transactions will show that the U.S. Government has paid for this coal at least more than \$5 million over this 5-year period than was warranted. I am sorry to say that this profit was not passed on to the hard-working coal miner but it was pocketed by a number of middlemen both in this country and in Europe.

A cursory study of the price paid will show a steady rise in the delivered price to the Army although the FOB price Philadelphia relatively remained constant as did the price paid to the mine operators. The reason for this was that the Army had unwittingly written into

the ground rules for bidding on this contract provisions which made competition impossible. Only the six largest producers in the industry representing only 50 percent of anthracite production have substantially benefited from the "buy American program."

Without competition the price of the coal continued to increase. This increase could not be substantiated in terms of the quoted prices for the coal in this country. For at least 2 of the 5 years the profit margin is as high as \$5 per ton when \$1 per ton would be considered a very reasonable profit spread. The U.S. Department of Justice in November of 1965, after 2 years of gathering evidence, has brought a civil suit against these six companies and their agents. The charge is that they unlawfully fixed prices on \$90 million worth of coal sold to the U.S. Army for use in Europe. Although the suit is now pending in the U.S. District

Court in Scranton, Pa., the Army none the less allowed the same practices to be used in the current fiscal year 1967 procurement.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Army used bad judgment in allowing this year's award to go to the same group which has made unreasonable profits over a 5-year period and is now a defendant in a civil suit arising from these profits. I will request, Mr. Speaker, that the General Accounting Office perform an independent audit to see whether or not the best interests of the Government have been served by the way Army procurement officials have handled these transactions.

Because they could not compete with the monopolistic practices of the big six, the small mine operators have been denied honest participation in this procurement. It must be understood that coal is a vital national resource. Small business coal miners are not asking for a Government subsidy but only the chance to participate in the only large purchase of anthracite coal that our Government makes. The Army has repeatedly denied the request that a small business set-aside be provided for in this procurement. The reason given was that the prime contractor is a foreign national. This is an absurd position in the light of the fact that in some parts of our coal regions unemployment is still as high as 7 percent.

This week I am making another request of the Secretary of the Army that a review be made of the decision not to allow either a small-business or a labor surplus set-aside for the fiscal year 1968 award.

I intend, Mr. Speaker, to continue my efforts to press for a more equitable distribution of this procurement at a fairer price to the U.S. Government. I will have more to report on this subject at a later date.

SCOUT TROOP 22 PRESENTED FLAG BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President presented to the 1917 Boy Scout Troop 22 a brandnew American flag to replace one given them in 1917 by President Woodrow Wilson. The original flag was later destroyed by fire.

Attending this sentimental and impressive ceremony were the following members of that great Scout troop, along with many wives, children, and grandchildren: Mr. Berry Brooks, Mr. Manuel Delugach, Mr. Edwin Erwin, Mr. Paul Gieselmann, Mr. Frank L. Miller, Dr. Edward Mitchell, Mr. Fred Pritchard, Mr. Charles Walles, Mr. Charles Ward, Mr. Mervin Roland, and Mr. Mervin Rosenbush, the scoutmaster of this troop in 1917 who was then and is now an inspiration to this distinguished group of citizens.

Our sheriff, Mr. William Morris, representing the Chickasaw Council was present with two of his children who are now Boy Scouts.

I take pleasure in inserting in the RECORD the President's remarks:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE SCHOOL SAVINGS BOND CEREMONY

Secretary Fowler; Congressman GRIDER; Dr. Essex; distinguished guests: I'm proud to accept this Liberty Bell. I'm proud of everything that young people across the country are doing for our Savings Bond program and for our Nation's future.

Nearly fifty years ago, another group of young people were working to guarantee their nation's future. During the second Liberty Bond drive in 1917, Boy Scout Troop Number 22 of Memphis, Tennessee sold more than 2,000 bonds worth \$672,100. One of those scouts—Charles Walles—was the top salesman in the country with \$445,500, in bond sales.

Today, we have Mr. Walles, Mr. Mervin Rosenbush, the scoutmaster, and nine members of that Boy Scout troop with us today.

Each of these men is a respected leader of his community. Each one, I think, would tell you that his early experience with the bond program played a part in preparing him to be a responsible citizen.

Since World War II, the school savings program which you represent today has been giving young people a lesson in thrift. Nearly ten billion stamps—worth \$2 billion—have been saved. Millions of people who learned to save with school savings stamps are now regular buyers of Savings Bonds.

But this program does more than teach thrift.

It gives you an opportunity to protect the heritage that this Liberty Bell represents.

It gives young people—even first graders—a chance to participate in the building of their nation.

It gives you an opportunity to show your pride—and to honor your obligations—as United States citizens.

This program helps all of us who enjoy freedom at home—to defend that freedom around the world.

So I hope that you and every other student in the land will keep the new Saving Stamp wallet card with you as a reminder of your stake in your country's strength and progress.

At a time of serious testing for our country, this card, and your purchase of Savings Stamps and Savings Bonds, are a symbol of one of our Nation's greatest treasures: the volunteer spirit.

When the Boy Scouts in Memphis sold more than half a million dollars in bonds in 1917, President Wilson sent them a flag as a tribute to their volunteer spirit.

Today they will take home another flag from the White House—to replace the original one which was destroyed in a fire.

But you young people can take home something which cannot be destroyed: the sense of high achievement which comes from unselfish service to your country.

As a reminder of our meeting, I am asking Dr. Martin Essex, national chairman of the school savings program, to give each of you a savings stamp album bearing one stamp—and my signature.

I hope you'll fill up this album—and many more.

I hope you and young people all over America will support the Savings Bond Program.

And I hope that years from now, you—like these citizens from Memphis whose service began when they were boys—can return here to remember this moment and urge others to follow your good example.

Thank you.

WHAT OAS ACTION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC ACCOMPLISHED

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today the curtain is being drawn on another important chapter in inter-American relations—peacekeeping by the Organization of American States in the Dominican Republic.

The last elements of the Inter-American Peace Force left Santo Domingo this morning almost 17 months from the day on which they landed.

This is a good time to look back on this experience and assess the results.

In April 1965 the situation in the Dominican Republic was bordering on chaos. Governmental authority had disintegrated with the fall of the Reid government. Public order had disappeared as armed bands roamed the capital city at will. Fighting between rival factions had broken out and civil war of the most bitter and cruel type was gradually engulfing the country. And into the political vacuum the Communists and their associates were moving at an alarming pace.

Both on humanitarian and security grounds the situation called for prompt action by the inter-American community. There was no time to waste.

President Johnson moved on April 28 to protect the lives of Americans and other foreign nationals caught in the Dominican holocaust. The following day the Organization of American States began its brilliantly successful peace keeping mission.

In the short span of less than 18 months the OAS worked out a cease-fire which put an end to the bloodshed; negotiated a settlement between the warring factions which permitted the establishment of a provisional government; assisted that government in getting the Dominican economy and political institutions functioning again, and collaborated with the provisional government in preparing the electoral machinery and holding the general elections of June 1.

Its mission of peace and conciliation accomplished, the OAS can now withdraw its forces, proud of what it has accomplished for the Dominican people and the hemisphere.

Looking back on the tough, controversial decisions which he had to make during those critical April days, President Johnson can also take great satisfaction. For the course of events has demonstrated that power wisely used in support of peace and freedom can bring about the successful outcome that we see in the Dominican Republic today.

LESSONS FROM THE DOMINICAN CRISIS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] has called our attention to the withdrawal of the last elements of the Inter-American Peace Force from Santo Domingo this morning.

I associate myself with his remarks. What the Organization of American States has accomplished in the Dominican Republic in the short span of 18 months is a remarkable performance. The Organization deserves every bit of the praise which it has received. And so do the Governments of Brazil, Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Paraguay who contributed forces to the Inter-American Peace Force and the other governments which provided the political support for the collective action which the regional organization took.

In retracing the experience and assessing the results as my colleague has done, I believe we should also look at the lessons which the Dominican experience brought out and how the hemisphere might profit by them.

One lesson, Mr. Speaker, is that in this day and age the inter-American community of nations cannot close its eyes and ears to violence in one of its member countries, affecting thousands of innocent people, simply because that violence is confined within national frontiers.

The deep sense of humanitarian responsibility which underlies our national and hemispheric traditions dictates that the community lend a helping hand to the people of a member state in distress.

A second lesson is that action by the community in situations where governmental authority is shattered and respect for law and order ceases need not—and does not—undermine the twin pillars of the inter-American system: the principles of self-determination and nonintervention.

Collective measures to stop senseless bloodshed and restore peace, followed by steps to insure that the will of the people is freely expressed through the electoral process, reinforce those principles instead of weaken them.

A third lesson, Mr. Speaker, is that the community—the individual governments as well as the multilateral organs through which they express their collective will—must be alert to situations of this kind and be prepared to move quickly and decisively.

The peace and security instruments of the OAS have amply demonstrated their flexibility and adaptability to new situations. Prompt collective action taken pursuant to such instruments makes unilateral action by any member unnecessary. It also places our regional organization in the position of fulfilling its humanitarian responsibilities to the people of our hemisphere and the world.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the lessons which I think can be gained from the Dominican experience. No one wishes to see that experience repeated. But we must be practical and realistic as we look ahead. We must always be

ready to make the lessons of the past serve as the answers for the future.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the OAS for a job superbly done and to wish the Dominican people well as they resume their quest for peace and prosperity in freedom.

GREATER TAX INCENTIVES FOR CONSTRUCTING POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to give new and stronger incentives to our industries and the entire private sector to move more vigorously against water and air pollution. My sponsorship of this bill results from a variety of circumstances. Water pollution is a particularly serious problem in New York State, with great industrial production and its high population density. My natural interest in this problem has been much sharpened by recent hearings held by my subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics investigating the present serious gaps in our pollution abatement technology. From these hearings it has been apparent to me that we are not going to make maximum progress in improvement of our streams until we have developed cheaper and more effective means of dealing with the problem. Increased research is an important part of the long-term solution to the problem. However, our problems in this area are immediate, and we must do what we can to see that present techniques are wisely and adequately funded.

We cannot depend on the public sector to do the immediate job quickly and well by itself. The problem has become too great; it requires broader treatment. Every resource, public and private, should be brought to bear on a national concern of such staggering dimension. Government is always at its best when it encourages and stimulates the private sector to assist in the solution of public problems. The genius of our Federal system lies in its emphasis on the carrot instead of the stick, incentives rather than punishment. The bill I have introduced offers the incentives of tax credits and deductions to the private sector. It encourages the type of investment which will reduce the cost of the public remedy.

My proposal is to provide an additional 7-percent tax credit for expenditures by private companies to reduce or eliminate water and air pollution. If the present 7-percent credit for capital investments is suspended, as the President has asked, my proposal would retain a 7-percent credit for pollution control expenditures. If the present 7 percent is retained, companies spending to clean up pollution could claim a credit for 14 percent of the cost. Also, my bill permits the deduction as a business expense for a period of 5 years of those

costs in excess of the tax credit percentage.

In addition to the important benefits of increased private participation which this bill will induce, this type of solution will also relieve somewhat the embarrassment under which our public programs are presently laboring. Nowhere near enough money is going into Government research on pollution abatement; much more is needed to overcome the obstacle to satisfactory pollution control. Worse yet, while Federal aid programs exist to encourage the building of community sewage disposal systems, these programs are funded at a small fraction of their potential. For instance, the Department of Housing and Urban Development recently informed me that its basic water and sewer program now has drawn some 2,500 applications, totaling \$2.5 billion; yet only \$100 million is being made available to the program by the administration this year. We have got to get on with the job somehow, and the prospects for direct public investment are not promising in view of such statistics.

I have been reluctant to submit this bill until I could learn the probable cost in terms of reduced tax revenues from the granting of the credit on taxes. I still do not know the answer, but probably it would be an informed guess at best. The problem of pollution is so pressing, however, and the direct public attack on it so inadequate, that I believe we should hasten to approve this type of private incentive program now.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES DOES NOT SPEAK FOR AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1966, the general board of the National Council of Churches, meeting at St. Louis, adopted a resolution calling for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations and the granting of U.S. diplomatic recognition to the Peiping regime. Dr. Daniel A. Poling, distinguished chaplain of the Chapel of Four Chaplains, Philadelphia, Pa., could not believe this body spoke for American Protestants or even American Protestant clergymen on this issue. Consequently he conducted a poll of 150,000 American Protestant clergymen on an individual basis and got back an almost 20-percent response, or 29,500 replies. Of these, 71.4 percent said "no" to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations and to the U.S. diplomatic recognition of Peiping; 93.7 percent of the American Protestant clergymen replying voted "no" to satisfying Red China's primary condition to joining the United Nations—the expulsion of the Republic of China. This is emphatic evidence that on such political issues the National Council of Churches speaks for

itself alone and not for American protestantism.

Subsequently, Dr. Poling has organized the Clergymen's Emergency Committee on China, to provide individual American clergymen with factual information and material on at least this one vital question, and to publicly articulate the sentiments of the majority where necessary.

Such action is fitting and proper. A body which purports to speak for American Protestants should not continue to go unchallenged when it in fact speaks against the convictions of the overwhelming majority of American Protestants. This is certainly the case in this instance. If Protestant ministers oppose this pronouncement of the NCC, how much greater must be the opposition of the laity, which as a group seems clearly to be well to the right of the clergy?

I congratulate Dr. Poling on this worthy venture.

FILIPINOS HAVE SHOWN DEMOCRACY CAN LIVE IN ASIA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, our legislative body and our country have experienced a refreshing and inspiring visit by President Marcos of the Philippines. It added strength to our mutual ties of brotherhood and friendship. The eloquence of President Marcos came not only from well chosen words and inspiring thoughts, but also from his evident sincerity. America is grateful for his having made this journey to visit us and we all hope that he takes back with him the true sentiments of all Americans, ones of gratitude and appreciation for our Filipino friends across the seas. I am happy to include in the RECORD the editorial by Dr. Diosdado M. Yap, in the current issue of Bataan, entitled "Dawn of a New Chapter," together with a biographical sketch of President Marcos from the same publication.

DAWN OF A NEW CHAPTER

A new era is about to dawn in the Philippines. With the inauguration of Ferdinand E. Marcos as the sixth President of the Philippine Republic, a new chapter in the history of our country will be written. The style will be different; the subject matter bizarre; the treatment novel; the pace fast and full of vigor; the development steady and ascending.

Previous chapters have been written under a different atmosphere and a different background. The tyrannies of political caciquism have been overthrown and the dictatorship of so-called established reputation has been demolished by the democracy of new values as assessed and decided by the common masses. The people have decided once and for all that the choice is theirs and they will take no dictation from any self-appointed dictator.

Ferdinand Marcos went to the people. He went from barrio to barrio, shook hands with

the people, ate with the people, lived with the people and showed them that he is one of them. And the people who were looking for a leader they can trust because he has their simplicity, their humility, their shortcomings and even their poverty, rallied around him and chose him as their man. Thus did Marcos frustrate the attempt to foist on the people one who had nothing in common with the people and who would have served his interests and not that of the people.

Marcos did something else. He raised the barrio to a national level, thereby concentrating public attention on the heretofore neglected and forgotten barrio people. This is fundamental in the Philippines today. For the barrio folk in 1966 are living in exactly the same condition as their grandfathers lived in 1896. The same nipa huts, the same impassable barrio roads, no plumbing facilities, the pigs and the goats and the chickens raised under the bamboo floor, the same rice and dried fish as their only food day in and day out.

The *caciques* could get loans from the Philippine National Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the tune of millions without any collateral and buy huge estates and plantations. But there was not a single centavo for the barrio people, none to improve their schools or their sanitation or give them or their children the promise of a better tomorrow. Marcos went to the barrios and told the people he was interested in their welfare, that he would prosecute the grafters, the crooks, the incompetents, and that he would give primacy to the barrio needs.

A new chapter will be written. Those who enriched themselves at the expense of the people, incompetents who flaunted their inabilities abroad with the flamboyance of playboys, the while playing at being diplomats when they have neither the brains nor the experience nor the prestige to represent the nation abroad, relatives who took advantage of their influence to mulct the gullible and the unwary, ten percenters who peddled power and patronage, tax evaders who have deprived the government of millions of revenue because they are close to Malacanang—all these will disappear from the political scene, for the day of reckoning has come for them. Under Marcos the dishonest will be punished and the incompetent weeded out.

This is indeed the dawn of a new day. The people went to the polls unafraid. They dared terrorism, intimidation, coercion. They watched the election inspectors, guarded the ballot boxes, reported attempts at committing frauds. It was an alert citizenry that took its duty seriously and exercised its right of suffrage with dignity and responsibility. The press was vigilant, fair and objective; the radio was on the job continuously, for forty-eight hours; the women took an active part, organized themselves into units and acted as vigilantes; the youth did their share in mobilizing public opinion against frauds and terrorism.

Eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty; it is the safeguard that can insure freedom. Where there is no vigilance liberty dies, democracy withers. The Filipino people showed that they deserve freedom because they can exercise that vigilance which free men know is indispensable to protect their rights and liberties.

But with vigilance must go sacrifice. Where the people are not willing to sacrifice themselves liberty is meaningless and democracy an empty word. And that is why we salute the new dynamic leader of our people, Ferdinand Marcos, whose personality now dominates the entire Philippine scene.

A new era dawns for the Philippines and Asia. The Filipinos have shown democracy can live in Asia. Where the people can exercise vigilance and are ready and willing to sacrifice personal ambitions to protect the

honor and welfare of their people, liberty like the sun will always shine resplendent, no matter how dark the night before. For liberty to be truly appreciated must be a jewel zealously guarded and at all times stoutly defended.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF PRESIDENT FERDINAND E. MARCOS, REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Of all the present Asian leaders, President Ferdinand E. Marcos of the Republic of the Philippines shows every sign of becoming the most persuasive and most deeply committed to the cause of democracy, both as a system opposed to communism and dedicated to peace with freedom.

It is not difficult to believe in this, for Ferdinand Marcos, born on Sept. 11, 1917, belongs to the generation that grew up in a time that was still stirred by World War I and in a country that was imbued with the democratic ideals learned from America, and passionately embraced by a people and their leaders who longed for freedom.

Ferdinand Marcos was a studious youth, as reflected in his high grades from elementary school through high school and college, and it was because of his serious mind that he soon became conscious of politics and the dynamics of government. Pursuing a law course in the state university, the University of the Philippines in Manila, he became a student leader and participated in student demonstrations against certain national ill at the time and for the early attainment of independence.

His life suddenly took a dramatic turn, when even as he was finishing his law course, he was accused of the murder of a political enemy of his father, Mariano Marcos, a public school teacher turned politician, who served a term as representative in the Philippine Legislature and later was appointed governor of Davao province in Mindanao. The Young Marcos was subsequently convicted by the local court in a highly controversial decision. He appealed his case while still in detention, at the same time continuing to review for the bar examinations.

He passed the bar in 1939, with one of the highest grades in bar history, and won his case, arguing his defense personally before the Philippine Supreme Court.

In 1941, as an ROTC reserve officer, he was drafted into the Philippine Army even as war clouds hovered over Asia. As a lieutenant in combat intelligence in Bataan, he soon proved to be a daring and resourceful officer. Leading critical patrol and combat missions in such famed battle areas as Mt. Natib, Mt. Samat and Salian River, he won many citations, including the Silver Star Medal and the U.S. Distinguished Service Cross, which General Douglas MacArthur himself pinned on him.

After the fall of Bataan, the young officer joined the resistance movement, but not before being sucked into the Death March to prison camp in Central Luzon and later undergoing torture at bleak Fort Santiago by the Japanese secret police as a guerrilla suspect. He escaped and founded an intelligence group, which he eventually fused with the guerrilla organization called the United States Armed Forces in the Philippines—Northern Luzon. This unit fought inside enemy lines in the rugged terrain of the Cordilleras range in the Mountain Province.

During the Liberation Campaign, President Marcos fought in one of the decisive battles of the war, the Battle of Bessang Pass, which led to the capture of General Yamashita, the commanding general of the Japanese Imperial Forces in the Philippines.

President Marcos emerged from the war with nearly every medal and decoration for courage and gallantry the Philippine and

American governments could bestow on a soldier. He received, in all 27 medals and decorations, making him the most decorated Filipino soldier in World War II. Four of his decorations were for five wounds sustained in battle.

His first taste of civil administration was his assignment to establish a government in the areas cleared of Japanese by his outfit, in Northern Luzon. He continued to do this, first as combat officer then as judge advocate general and civil affairs officer of the USAFIP-NL. From this experience, he went actively into public service.

He served as a technical assistant to President Manuel A. Roxas, the first President of the Republic of the Philippines in 1946, then led a mission of Filipino officers in 1947 to Washington, D.C., to secure from the U.S. Congress arrears-in-pay and other benefits for Filipino World War II veterans.

In 1949, at 32 years, he ran for the Philippine Congress, and won a seat as representative of the second district of his home province, Ilocos Norte, in Northern Luzon. It was the same district once represented by his father. This launched his political career.

He served as Congressman for three consecutive terms—one term is four years—and after his third term, he ran for senator and won the highest number of votes among the senatorial candidates. That was in 1949. As with his career in the Lower House, he was a leading senator, occupying vital positions of leadership.

In the Senate, he was minority leader and then President. He also served as a member of the National Economic Council, the Council of Leaders and the Council of State.

A prolific lawmaker, he established a record during his terms in both Houses for the most number of important bills introduced, many of which were passed. He pioneered in land reform legislation, championed the Land Tenure Act in the House and steered the passage of the Land Reform Code in the Senate. He also worked to strengthen trade unionism, was co-sponsor of the Magna Carta of Labor and the Anti-Scab Law.

President Marcos had, indeed, a broad interest as legislator, which ranged from agriculture to civil liberties, economics to foreign relations. It was as though he was rehearsing for the Philippine presidency, for which he set his hat from the jump-off point of the senate presidency, which he held at the time he broke off with the then President Macapagal and the Liberal Party, and joined the Nacionalista Party.

In the Nacionalista Party national convention of 1965, he fought a hard but masterly battle, with the odds against him, being a neophyte member of the party while contesting the presidential nomination with veteran Nacionalista leaders. The resounding triumph of President Marcos, in a way indicated what was to come in the presidential campaign that was to follow. As it turned out, it was an uphill battle all the way, but the votes ultimately gave President Marcos a clear-cut mandate from the people.

In his first six months in office, President Marcos spiritedly faced up to the crisis in government, which had to contend with low morale, depressed public funds, and an economic slump. Today, there is a new briskness in government operations, resumed economic activities, and a fresh public confidence in the national leadership.

In foreign relations, President Marcos unequivocally reiterated Philippine support of the free way of life and the Philippines' staunch opposition to communism, as proven by his vigorous advocacy of Philippine assistance to South Vietnam in its struggle against communist aggression. He has also sparked the resumption of Philippine diplomatic ties with the Federation of Malaysia, the recognition of Singapore, and the rapprochement between Malaysia and Indonesia.

He has enunciated a policy of support for any move to strengthen economic, cultural and mutual defense agreements among friendly Asian countries, in the interest of common development and stability.

HATCH ACT VIOLATED

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Post Office Department in supplying secretarial assistance to a candidate for Congress as alleged in the following newspaper article is, in my opinion, a shocking violation of the Hatch Act.

If the Hatch Act is to be deliberately disregarded by the departments and agencies of Government then it ought to be abolished and further deception of the public and Federal employees be ended.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the RECORD in connection with these remarks the following article in the Des Moines Register of the date of September 21, 1966:

ARTICLE BY CLARK R. MOLLENHOFF

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Post Office Department has "loaned" a \$9,000 a year secretary to Democratic Congressman JAMES MORRISON at a time he is engaged in a heated runoff political campaign in Louisiana.

Charles Johnson, staff director of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, confirmed that he made the arrangements to borrow the secretary, Mrs. June Lyle from the office of Assistant Postmaster General William McMillan.

McMillan took full responsibility for the arrangement from the Post Office, and said that as far as he knew Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien "doesn't know a thing about it."

Johnson said Tuesday that Mrs. Lyle was borrowed on a "sort of a quid pro arrangement" the committee has with the Post Office Department.

"We like to scratch each other's backs," Johnson said. "We are helpful to these agencies from time to time, and they help us out when we're in a press."

Mrs. Lyle was reported by Johnson to be assigned to work for a House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee. Actually, she has been at work last week and this week in MORRISON's congressional office in the Rayburn Office Building.

The "press" of business that necessitated the request for a Post Office secretary in this instance was the press of the bitter run-off campaign for the Democratic nomination for Sixth District Congressman in Louisiana.

MORRISON, the ranking member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, is the heir apparent to the chairmanship of the committee. He is in serious political difficulty because of his support of the Johnson administration on a broad range of subjects including spending programs and civil rights.

Although a veteran of 24 years in the House, MORRISON failed to poll 51 percent of the votes cast in the five-man Democratic primary in August and is now in a two-man runoff against John R. Rarick, a former county judge.

The race has included charges by MORRISON that Rarick is a member of the Ku Klux Klan, a charge that Rarick denies. Rarick has filed a \$500,000 damage suit against MORRISON in connection with the charges.

Rarick charges that MORRISON is a rubber-stamp for the Johnson administration on civil rights and other programs. While the spending of the Johnson administration is reported to be an issue, it is the civil rights issue that is most heated.

Mrs. Florence Cooley, an administrative aide to MORRISON, explained the "frantic" race that has "everyone in the office working on the campaign."

She explained that "the Johnson administration is so hated that a lot of the voters would rather support the Klan."

Mrs. Cooley said that MORRISON has "a wonderful relationship" with the Johnson administration, but that it is impossible for President Johnson, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY or other high administration figures to give him any support in the open.

HUMPHREY "unwittingly" had done much damage to MORRISON with a speech in July, Mrs. Cooley said. She said that HUMPHREY had tried to help MORRISON with a speech in Louisiana, but that "it was one of the worst speeches ever."

"We know Mr. HUMPHREY didn't intend to hurt Mr. MORRISON, but his speech was awful," Mrs. Cooley said. "He said something about leading riots and it was just the wrong thing."

She referred to the speech HUMPHREY gave on July 18, 1966, in New Orleans in which he said that if he had lived in a ghetto with rats nibbling on his children's clothes, he "might lead a mighty good revolt" himself. That speech has come in for widespread criticism from Republicans, as well as conservative southern Democrats.

Mrs. Cooley said that MORRISON had not expected a close race in the primary in which there were five candidates, but his opponents had put a James E. Morrison in the race to "confuse the voters." The James E. Morrison, a Baton Rouge grocer, polled 6,681 votes which Mrs. Cooley said was enough to block MORRISON from polling the necessary 51 percent in the primary.

"Mr. MORRISON didn't even know he (HUMPHREY) was coming down there, and he said later he would have been better off if he'd never come down here," Mrs. Cooley said.

The labor organizations are solidly behind MORRISON, Mrs. Cooley said, "especially those letter carrier groups." She said the postal workers and other Government employees who favor MORRISON "can't do anything because of the Hatch Act" which forbids active political campaigning by career Government employees.

Ira Kapenstein, the Post Office Department public relations officer, said he did not know the policy or the law relative to loaning employees to work for a Congressman during a campaign.

McMillan said that he did not know that Mrs. Lyle was going to work in MORRISON's office. He said he received a call from Johnson who told him there was "a heavy workload" and that the House committee needed an experienced secretary for one or two weeks.

McMillan said he had assumed that Mrs. Lyle was working in a committee office.

"I run the operations division of the Post Office," McMillan said. "I can't spend all my time running around to find out where these people are."

Kapenstein said he believed that McMillan "had a right to rely on statements from Johnson that she was working for the House committee."

McMillan said that the loaning of Mrs. Lyle was done with the understanding that the House committee would "reimburse" the Post Office Department for the time she worked at the Capitol.

Under questioning, McMillan said there was no written record made of the arrangements with Johnson for the "loan" of the services of Mrs. Lyle or the "reimbursement."

"It was just a telephone conversation," McMillan said. "When Mrs. Lyle came back, the Post Office Department would simply bill the committee for that part of her salary."

He said he saw nothing wrong with the Post Office Department loaning an employee to the House committee or to a Congressman. He said he was "not familiar with the Hatch Act" and could not say if it was proper or improper for a career Post Office employee to engage in work that helped Morrison in a political campaign.

"I would defer to Mr. Kapenstein on that," McMillan said.

In answer to a question, Kapenstein said "It would be improper for a Post Office employee to engage in political work." He said that the Post Office Department will investigate to determine if Mrs. Lyle was doing political work or was merely engaged in work that relieved others in Morrison's office so they could engage in political work.

Representative H. R. Gross (Rep., Iowa) declared that in his view it would be improper for the executive branch to loan secretaries to the Congress for any purpose where it would "directly or indirectly represent a political assistance."

"The law was designed to prevent this type of thing, and it makes no difference whether the individual employee was involved directly or indirectly in the campaign activity," Gross said. "If we would excuse such activity where the employee is said to replace another employee who has gone off campaigning, then we would be providing a big loophole for the worst abuses possible."

Gross said such a loophole would make it possible to use all of the secretaries "A manpower pool for pure political maneuvering."

He said that the Post Office action in loaning secretaries to Congress during an election campaign "is an arrogant disregard for the intent of the Hatch Act."

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H.R. 17873, an omnibus bill on the Reorganization of Congress to carry out the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, contained in its final report filed with the Congress, July 28, 1966, Senate Report No. 1414, House Report No. 1781.

In my remarks today I shall first review briefly the work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; second, enumerate and discuss briefly the most important recommendations of the joint committee; third, discuss some of the provisions contained in the bill I am introducing today and; fourth, give reasons why I believe the Congress should enact these reforms.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress was established by unanimous vote of both the House and the Senate in March of 1965. May 10, 1965, the committee commenced a series of 41 public hearings and received the views of 199 witnesses. The testimony, together with statements, documents and an index, is contained in 16 printed volumes, totaling 2,435 pages. The committee was very generous in receiving the

views of anyone who cared to testify. Among the witnesses were 17 Senators and 59 Representatives who testified in person. In addition, 4 Senators and 26 Representatives submitted statements for the record.

Interim reports were filed by the committee July 8, 1965, and January 19, 1966, in which the recommendations and suggestions received to those dates were summarized.

Between January 19, 1966, and the filing of the report on July 28, 1966, the committee and its staff met in over 50 executive sessions considering the proposed reforms and formulating its recommendations and the narrative to comprise its final report to the Congress. Subsequently, the members and the staff, conferring with the legislative counsels of the House and the Senate, have engaged in the preparation of an omnibus bill, which I have introduced today, H.R. 17873.

FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

On the whole, the report of the committee is constructive and if the recommendations are enacted into law and then the reforms suggested are actually carried out in succeeding Congresses, in my judgment it should lead to a better performance of the legislative function and to the strengthening of the Congress in our tripartite system of government.

As we pointed out in our additional views, commencing on page 84 of the final report, we think the committee's recommendations of reform did not go far enough and that there are many additional areas of legislative responsibility in which Congress could be made more effective. Nevertheless, this is possibly not as serious as it might appear at first since the committee did adopt one major reform; namely, it recommended the establishment of a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations with continuing authority to study the structure and procedures of the Congress with a view to recommending reforms from time to time.

The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations would be provided with a staff which would enable it to make studies in these areas of further congressional reform with a view to further strengthening the Congress, with improvements adopted from time to time as the Congress deemed appropriate. For example; the report of the committee does not deal with such thorny subjects as executive privilege, lobbying by the executive, or relationships between Congress and the courts; all of which, of course, were within the original mandate of study assigned to the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. These areas should be examined by the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. I express the hope that if such a committee is established, it will equip itself with an able staff to enable it to make a penetrating study of these very delicate but important subjects.

PROVISIONS FOR THE MINORITY

Minority members felt quite strongly that where the executive and the legislative branches of the Government were

in the control of the same party, that the committees of the Congress having the responsibility of examining the efficiency and economy of operations in the executive branch of the Government; either the Government Operations Committee or perhaps a new committee to be called a Committee on Procedures and Policies, should be under the control of the minority party. The obvious purpose of this provision would be to insure proper scrutiny and review by the Congress of the expenditures by the executive branch and the exercise of vast authority delegated to executive agencies and that the laws are honestly and efficiently administered. In the British House of Commons, the Committee on Public Accounts is by tradition under the chairmanship of a leading member of the opposition; usually a person who had been Financial Secretary to the Treasury. In the Republican Harding administration, the Teapot Dome investigation was assigned by a Republican Senate to a committee chaired by a Democratic Senator, Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana.

Minority party members of the joint committee were unable to persuade the committee to accept this concept of congressional review of executive action and I do not delude myself into thinking that an amendment to achieve this on the floor when the bill is up for consideration would meet with much success.

Aside from this provision, however, I must say that the members of the joint committee were quite cooperative in making a number of provisions for the advantage of the minority, as follows: First, committee staffing; second, minority views in reports; third, equal time on conference reports; fourth, provision for the minority of a committee to schedule witnesses on at least 1 day of hearings, and; fifth, House Committee on Standards and Conduct.

COMMITTEE STAFFING

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provided for four professional and six clerical staff. It provided that the professional members should be selected without regard to partisan considerations and solely on the basis of competence to perform their duties. It also provided that the professional staff and the clerical staff should be assigned to the chairman and the ranking minority member. Senator MONRONEY, who was vice chairman of the 1946 Reorganization Committee, indicated that he believed that this provision would provide the minority with adequate staff assistance to express their dissent effectively in cases where there was dissent. In actual practice, however, it worked out, in some committees at least, that the minority were not given the staff assistance with which to develop and record their positions effectively. Therefore, in our final report, the committee, in increasing the number of statutory committee staff positions from four to six, earmarked at least two of those positions for the minority, to be selected by the minority and to be assigned to the minority to assist them. Similarly, with respect to the six clerical positions, it was provided that at least one of the clerical positions should

be filled by and assigned to the minority. This recommendation appears on page 21 of the final report under recommendation No. 2.

In addition, where committees request funds for staff beyond the 12 statutory positions, it is provided that in an annual resolution authorizing additional staff for committees and subcommittees, that the minority shall have fair consideration in staff selections for the subcommittees and that all minority staff personnel should be entitled to equitable treatment, including comparable salary, facilities, and access to committee records.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There is now nothing in the rules which guarantees any committee member who dissents from the position taken by the majority, the right to file supplemental, additional, or minority views and to have them included in the report filed with the parent body.

The joint committee in its final report on page 12, in recommendation No. 14, requires that reports, when prepared, be submitted to all members and that they be allowed 2 days within which to prepare and file with the clerk their additional, supplemental, or minority views, which shall be included with the report filed with the parent body and printed in the same document as the majority report.

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Under present procedures, conference reports are prepared by those prevailing in the conference and there is no provision for dissenting or differing explanatory statements of the agreement arrived at in conference. Likewise, the conference report, when presented to the parent body, is handled in the House of Representatives by the ranking majority manager on the part of the House, and the time is controlled by that single member. Any time granted to those who oppose the conference report is a matter of grace and there is no entitlement as a matter of right to those opposing the conference report to express their dissent. The committee sought to remove this inequity by providing that individual members of the conference committee could submit their own individual explanatory views of what occurred in the conference and also, that the minority viewpoint be fully expressed when the conference report is submitted to the parent body by providing that those opposing the conference report should have equal time for expressing their dissent.

MINORITY SCHEDULING OF WITNESSES

Under present procedures, scheduling of the hearings and the witnesses who appear and the testimony to be given is all within the control of the committee, which means the majority of the committee. To provide a balanced record to insure all points of view are obtained, where the minority so desires, it is entitled under the recommendations of the joint committee to call witnesses of its own choosing for at least one day of hearings. This is provided on page 11 of the committee's final report under recommendation No. 12, that the minority of a committee shall be entitled, upon its

request, to call witnesses of its choice during at least 1 day of the hearing.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT

The final report on page 48, under the topic, "Ethics," recommends that the House of Representatives create a Committee on Standards and Conduct. While this brief statement concerning this committee does not spell out the characteristics it should have, it does indicate that the House might very well examine the Senate Special Committee on Standards and Conduct, which does provide for an equal number of majority and minority members. H.R. 17138, introduced by Representative MADDEN on August 18, 1966, on page 40, line 22, contains language creating a Committee on Standards and Conduct, which provides that it shall consist at all times of an even number of members, equally divided between the majority party and minority party.

I have substantially altered some of the provisions of the Madden bill relating to the Committee on Standards and Conduct in the bill I have introduced today and shall discuss these differences and the reasons for them later in my remarks. At this point, I only wish to note that with respect to the matter of conduct of members, officers and employees of the House of Representatives, the joint committee did agree that this was not a partisan matter and that the Committee on Standards and Conduct should be a bi-partisan committee.

Aside from the provisions for more equitable treatment for the minority, which I have discussed, there are many recommendations which, in my judgment, will go a long way toward improving the operations of the Congress if they are carried out in future Congresses. I shall discuss these recommendations briefly under the following headings:

First. Measures aimed at relieving time pressures on Members.

Second. Fiscal controls and budgetary reforms.

Third. Bill of rights for committees.

Fourth. Continuing studies of congressional organization and an agency to concern itself about Congress as an institution.

MEASURES AIMED AT RELIEVING TIME PRESSURES ON MEMBERS

Since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, wholly new fields have developed, such as atomic energy, space, automation and computer science, and there have been notable advances in communications, transportation, medicine and health, science, and other fields of human endeavor, in all of which the Federal Government is deeply involved. In addition, in the last two decades the Federal Government has assumed a role in areas of social activity hitherto left to the States and local governments or to private citizens and organizations.

Thus, the workload of the Congress—its policy-making responsibility—has increased immeasurably, not only in magnitude, but in complexity and sophistication, and has imposed immense conflicting demands on the time of the 535 elected Senators and Representatives.

Many of the committee's recommendations are aimed at alleviating these pressures. Among them are:

The elimination of noncongressional chores, such as recommendations for appointments in the postal service by Members of the House and their confirmation by the Senate.

Enlarged staffs for committees.

A legislative assistant for Senators. The House provided \$7,000 additional clerk-hire allowance for Members May 17, 1966, by House Resolution 855.

The committee recommended strengthening and improvement of the Legislative Reference Service, renaming it the Legislative Research Service and reorienting its approach to conform more nearly with the needs of Congress; to give it more versatility through facilitating employment of consultants and experts on an intermittent temporary basis on contract; and providing better supervision and review by the Joint Committee on the Library.

Authorizing committees to employ consultants on an intermittent temporary basis to take advantage of expertise in various fields of knowledge of interest to committees.

Authorizing committees to upgrade the talents and capacity of permanent staff personnel through additional training at committee expense, subject to the approval of the Administration Committees of the two bodies.

Improving the capacity of committees to review the administration of the laws and the expenditure of appropriated funds by providing an additional staff position called Legislative Review Specialist, with the specific duty of directing the committee's attention to the administration of the laws which fall within its legislative jurisdiction.

FISCAL CONTROLS AND BUDGETARY REFORMS

The committee has made a number of recommendations which should facilitate a more effective exercise of the congressional power of the purse. Under these recommendations, more use would be made of the General Accounting Office and its staff in establishing a standard classification code of activities and expenditures; in providing information as to the location and nature of fiscal data available in the various agencies and departments; in providing expert assistance to the Congress in the analysis of cost-effectiveness studies prepared by agencies and departments of the Federal Government, and preparing tabulations of budget data and information for a committee or a Member of Congress.

The budget would be required to contain multiple year financial projections of programs with commitments for future years and updating of the budget on June 1 of each year, and the Appropriations Committees of each House would be required to hold general hearings on the budget within 30 days after its presentation to Congress. Legislative committees would be required to include in their reports estimates of the cost to be incurred in carrying out the bill reported in the fiscal year in which it is reported and each of the 5 fiscal years following

such year or for the authorized duration of the program; and to authorize programs in such form as to require annual appropriations for carrying them out.

Provisions relating to the legislative budget in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 were repealed. Those provisions had proved unworkable over the years and the committee was unable to devise any satisfactory mechanism to supplant it, other than the fiscal reforms referred to above.

In my judgment, these reforms are an inadequate substitute for the independent legislative budget which I think the Congress should develop. This is a subject which should receive further attention and study by the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

COMMITTEE BILL OF RIGHTS

The committee was unable to find any suitable alternative for the tradition of electing chairman of committees by the respective Houses, largely on the basis of longevity of service. It sought to establish procedures guaranteeing equitable treatment, some of which I have previously mentioned where I referred to advantages given to the minority, such as the calling of witnesses and guaranteeing opportunity to file dissenting views. Additional provisions in the form of announcement of record votes, the ability of a majority to compel the filing of a report or bill; the prohibition of proxies and the printing of committee rules at the beginning of each session, likewise should enable the majority of a committee at all times to control committee proceedings regardless of attempted arbitrary action by a chairman.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

Perhaps the most far reaching and potentially the most beneficial of the recommendations of the joint committee is the establishment of a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations on a permanent basis. This committee would have the responsibility of making a continuing study of the organization and procedures of the Congress and its relations with the executive and judicial branches of the Government with a view toward recommending reforms to strengthen the Congress from time to time as developments warrant.

I understand my colleague on the joint committee, Dr. HALL, intends to develop this subject in somewhat greater detail and for that reason, I will say no more about it at this time.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The bill I am introducing is identical in all respects with the bill S. 3848 being introduced by the six Senate Members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress today, except for the provisions relating to a Committee on Standards and Conduct of the House of Representatives.

The Senate bill S. 3848 was reported by the Special Senate Committee on the Organization of Congress today, Report No. 1629.

The provisions relating to the House Committee on Standards and Conduct of

the Senate bill S. 3848 are the same as those in H.R. 17138, introduced by Congressman MADDEN on August 18, 1966. They appear in the Madden bill, commencing on page 40, line 2, continuing to page 43, line 16. Both versions, H.R. 17873 and S. 3848, have the same purpose; namely, to investigate individual instances of misconduct by Members, officers, or employees of the House and also to recommend a code of ethics.

My bill does, however, have one major difference. Under the Madden bill, it is provided that the committee shall select the chairman and the vice chairman from among its members and the same provision is contained in my bill, but the Madden bill goes on to say the chairman shall be a member of the majority party and the vice chairman shall be a member of the minority party. This seems to me to restrict unnecessarily members of the Committee on Standards and Conduct. Under both bills the committee would be bipartisan, in the sense that the membership would be equally divided between the majority and minority parties. In my view, the committee might very well, in this sensitive area relating to conduct of Members, officers, and employees of the House, desire to allay any suspicion that the inquiry might be a whitewash by electing as chairman of the committee a member of the minority party.

Incidentally, I believe all should be on notice that the resolutions reported from the House Rules Committee providing for a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct would create a temporary committee, which would expire with the 89th Congress. That committee might well not even be established before the adjournment of the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

One of the reasons I believe the House should establish a Committee on Standards and Conduct is that many times unfounded allegations are made against Members which upon inquiry would be found to be without any basis whatever and the Committee on Standards and Conduct could clear the air in such cases.

CONGRESS SHOULD ENACT ORGANIZATIONAL REFORMS BEFORE ADJOURNING

It is my considered judgment that this Congress ought not to adjourn sine die without having acted on congressional reform.

My reasons are as follows:

First. The bill is ready.

Second. Both Houses unanimously determined reform was necessary.

Third. If, as the creation of our joint committee indicates, Congress requires strengthening and modernizing, time is of the essence.

Fourth. Reforms should be enacted now—so that the new 90th Congress may organize, utilizing the new institutions and procedures.

Fifth. If the 90th Congress organizes under old forms and practices—vested interests will develop and will inhibit change, making the adoption of meaningful reforms more difficult.

Sixth. If we put off reorganizing Congress, we will indicate it is a matter of low priority, thus, encouraging inaction in the next Congress.

Seventh. Many who have actively participated in this fight to strengthen Congress—who are familiar with conditions and the reasons for change—may not be available to participate in guiding reform legislation through Congress next year. Furthermore, we should act while the considerations leading to the recommended reforms are fresh in our minds, leading to more meaningful discussion.

Eighth. If no bill is passed before adjournment, the Democratic Party and its leaders must face the electorate in November with a record of weakness and inaction. With overwhelming majorities in both Houses, they will be recorded as unwilling to adopt reforms unanimously recommended by a blue-ribbon bipartisan committee.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, the ranking Republican House Member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

I agree with him especially in his concluding remarks that it is important that this Congress take action immediately on the urgent problem of congressional reorganization so that any reforms which the Congress approves can take effect at the beginning of the 90th Congress.

In my judgment, it would be a tragedy if the dedicated efforts of the 12 members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, who diligently applied themselves to the mandate given them to study the organization and procedures of Congress, were to have been given in vain because of inaction or indifference on the part of the members and leadership of the two Houses.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize fully that there are controversial features in this bill. At the outset we were well aware that no change could be made in the existing procedures and structure of the Congress without interfering with vested interests in the old way of doing things. Certainly in the deliberations of our 12-man Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, we ran into many disagreements and controversies. Yet we were able to agree upon a report signed by all 12 members and I say the Congress, likewise, should consider our recommendations and work its will, but at least let the Nation have something to show in the way of progress in modernizing and strengthening the Congress.

If there is one single reform more important than others, in my judgment, it is the recommendation that there be created a continuing Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. This committee would consist of five Senators and five Representatives, of whom, in each House, a majority and a minority member of the Committees on Government Operations, and the House Administration and Senate Rules and Administration Committees would be appointed by the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate.

The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations would have the duty on a continuous basis of studying the organi-

zation and operations of the Congress and recommending improvements with a view towards strengthening Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the U.S. Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States.

One of the reasons our committee was able to arrive at agreement on its final report was because many of us felt that with the establishment of a continuing Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, areas of legislative reform upon which we were unable to agree or problems of congressional operations for which we were unable to find a satisfactory solution, could be taken up by the continuing Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

For example, in no less than 7 of the 15 points made in the additional views of the Republican House members of the joint committee, we indicated that subjects should be studied by the proposed Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. These items are as follows:

First. Enforcement of section 1913 of title XVIII of the U.S. Code, prohibiting lobbying with appropriated funds by the executive branch.

Second. Campaign expenditures.

Third. Contested elections.

Fourth. Contempt citations.

Fifth. Exercise of the congressional power to declare war.

Sixth. Advantage of incumbency and the seniority system.

Seventh. Executive privilege, related to Congress and the people—credibility gap.

We, likewise, urged that membership on the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations be equally divided between the parties, and many of the other points in our additional views could well receive the scrutiny of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

In addition to its study, the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations would have the responsibility of following up on the recommendations of our temporary joint committee and the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966 to see how those reforms are working out and whether or not they were being observed by the Congress. In the light of actual experience, the committee might well recommend modification or even repeal of some of those reforms.

In addition, the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations would have the responsibility for continuously studying automatic data processing and information retrieval systems with a view to determining possible utilization of such systems for the benefit of the Congress. This committee's studies in this field would also facilitate, not replace, the review and oversight activities of other congressional committees as they might be affected by increased computerization of the executive branch.

The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations would concern itself with the Congress as an institution, study improved ways of providing services and facilities for Members and committees and familiarize itself with liti-

gation which might affect the operations of the Congress.

The Congress, its committees and its members, are sometimes involved as parties litigant. Traditionally, in these cases representation has been by private counsel, sometimes not paid for by the Congress; or by the Department of Justice, likewise not paid by the Congress for these services.

Just a few weeks ago, as we all recall, a Federal district judge issued an injunction against a committee of Congress. Happily, the injunction was promptly vacated.

In addition, the constitutional authority of the Congress, the will or intent of Congress and even the application of parliamentary rules have been passed upon by the courts. In a few cases involving constitutional powers, the Congress has been represented by appearances by Senators, Representatives or other attorneys as *amicus curiae*. This representation has been on a sporadic basis and sometimes at no expense to the Congress. In contempt and perjury cases involving the powers of the Congress and its parliamentary procedures, Congress usually has been represented by the Department of Justice, at no expense to the Congress.

This legal representation of the Congress with respect to its vital interests is unsatisfactory and the effect upon Congress of court decisions should be a matter of continuous concern for which some legal agency of the Congress should take responsibility. The committee considered this function peculiarly appropriate to be assigned to the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations as a part of its responsibility for Congress as an institution.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress will act promptly on the recommendations of our Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress and express the hope that if some of the provisions of the bill fall by the wayside during the process of enactment, at least the provision for the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations will be preserved.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, although it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress for only 4 months, I have long been closely involved in the subject of congressional reform.

Shortly after the resolution was passed creating the joint committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], of our House Republican Committee on Planning and Research, appointed a task force to study this matter in depth, with particular emphasis on the pressing need of the minority for more staff on most of the standing committees.

As a first order of business, the task force encouraged Members from our side of the aisle to present their views to the joint committee. We were gratified at the close of the committee's hearings to learn that proportionately more Republican than Democratic Members of the House had shown a willingness to come forward with their views and suggestions toward strengthening our ailing national legislature. I ought to add that each Member's testimony was a true reflection

of his personal convictions—the only assistance provided by our task force concerned the scheduling of our witnesses.

As a second order of business, we prepared a study outline for research in depth of key areas by a now expanded task force of 21 Members. For the record, I submit the following table of contents from "We Propose: A Modern Congress," published by the McGraw-Hill Book Co., which contains the results of our research:

CONTENTS

Foreword, THOMAS B. CURTIS, M.C., vii.
Introduction, GERALD R. FORD, M.C., xi.
PART 1. THE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE, 1
1. "The Need for Increased Minority Staffing," JAMES C. CLEVELAND, M.C., 5.
2. "The Seniority System," Hon. John V. Lindsay, 23.
3. "Rules and Procedure of the Standing Committees," ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, U.S. Senator, 37.
4. "Strengthening the Committee Structure: The Problem of Overlapping Jurisdiction," F. BRADFORD MORSE, M.C., 57.
PART 2. POLICY-MAKING, LOBBYING, AND OVERSIGHT, 69
5. "Science Policy and Congress," JOHN B. ANDERSON, M.C., 73.
6. "Congress and Foreign Policy," OGDEN R. REID, M.C., 85.
7. "Reforming the Budgetary and Fiscal Machinery of Congress," ROBERT MCCLORY, M.C., 105.
8. "Lobbying," PAUL FINDLEY, M.C., 135.
9. "Lobbying by the Administration," ANCHER NELSEN, M.C., 143.
10. "Reorganization of the Committees on Government Operations and Minority Control of Investigation," ROBERT H. MICHEL, M.C., 163.
PART 3. TOWARD MORE EFFICIENCY AND A BETTER IMAGE, 177
11. "Congressional Pages: Their work and Schooling," WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, M.C., 181.
12. "Reforms Needed in House Personnel Procedures," JOEL T. BROYHILL, M.C., 191.
13. "Floor Procedure in the House of Representatives," JOHN J. RHODES, M.C., 201.
14. "Electric Voting in the House," DURWARD G. HALL, M.C., 217.
15. "Contested Elections to the House of Representatives," ROBERT C. McEWEN, M.C., 225.
16. "The Cost of Getting There and Length of Stay," LAURENCE J. BURTON, M.C., 237.
17. "Congressional Ethics," BOB WILSON, M.C., 253.
PART 4. INFORMATION, TECHNOLOGY, AND CITIZENS' RIGHTS, 261
18. "The Case for Television and Radio Coverage," ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, M.C., 265.
19. "Managing the District of Columbia," CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, Jr., M.C., 271.
20. "The Operation of the Congressional Office," DONALD RUMSFELD, M.C., 281.
21. "Information Handling: For a Vast Future Also," Fred Schwengel, 303.
Appendices, 319.

Most of our suggestions were made known to the joint committee at various stages of the committee's work, even after the hearings had been completed. So, while it is our hope that this book will stimulate public discussion of the role of today's Congress, there is little in its pages that can be considered new material for the joint committee.

As a third order of business, we have attempted to keep the dialog moving on our side of the aisle in a constant effort to find new and better answers to

the problems of inefficiency, confusion, and the diminishing influence of today's Congress.

The case for House Republicans on the issue of congressional reform could hardly be clearer: our efforts, conclusions, and sincere purpose are matters of public record. Our supplemental views in the final report of the joint committee attest to this.

I wish to add only two further comments to the remarks of my Missouri colleagues here this afternoon. First, from painful experience, our task force can testify to the complexity and vast scope of the problem of congressional reorganization. It is a job of no mean proportions to study various aspects of the overall problem and submit research conclusions based on data compiled in this compartmentalized fashion. It is exceedingly more difficult to shape an omnibus bill of more than 100 compatible separate reforms. As chairman of our task force, I fully appreciate how intricate and painstaking a process it is to analyze, sort, and eventually weld together, the many pieces that go to make up a progressive reform bill.

By way of a final observation, I wish to comment on the distinguished work of my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. Congressional reform has had no stronger a champion in this Congress or more persistent an advocate in Congress than he. His patient scholarship, driving determination, and self-effacing assistance have sustained and guided our task force efforts, and his wisdom is in the bill he had introduced today. I have a number of reasons for supporting this legislation, and not the least of them is the knowledge that it has come to fruition out of the labor and influence of the ranking House Republican member of the Joint Organization Committee. At an appropriate time I will discuss certain shortcomings of this legislation based on the significant and constructive recommendations in our supplemental views.

DROUGHT RELIEF FOR FARMERS: PROBLEMS AND PROPOSALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, after a long, dry, devastating summer, the rains have finally come to the eastern seaboard. Unfortunately, though, the recent rain has been too late to offset the impact of even this year's drought, much less to make amends for the cumulative effects of 5 consecutive years of low precipitation. The storms of September cannot solve the problems which began in June, July, and August, and which will plague many farmers next January, February, and March.

The able and industrious farmers of my own State, Maryland, are now beset not only by the problems which confront farmers throughout the Nation, but also by the special and serious woes inflicted by the drought. Many of them are now in deep economic trouble, caused by the

quirks of weather and compounded by the vagaries of Agriculture Department policies. Because of drought, their production of feed grains, both for commercial markets and for their own use, is down. Because of the inexorable rules of dwindling supply and increasing demand, their overhead is up. Because of the rigidity of Agriculture Department regulations, no real relief can be obtained.

Three statements summarize the present situation. First, Mr. James M. Voss, chairman of the Maryland State ASC Committee, reported in his Informational Letter of September 1 that the estimated Maryland corn crop for 1966, based on the August 1 crop conditions, had dropped 36 percent below the estimate which had been based on crop conditions on July 1. At the same time, he observed that the estimated yield per acre this year, as of August 1, was 45 bushels, over 39 percent below last year.

Second, a Frederick County dairy farmer advised me earlier this month that his expenses for feed grains alone had risen 5.5 percent in the past 6 weeks. All signs indicate that these prices will continue upward, while the volume of feed grains required for his herd can only be reduced at a sacrifice of production.

Third, I have been advised that the average age of Maryland dairy farmers is now 49. This startling figure reflects the fact that many younger farmers, with relatively slim resources, have either been driven out of farming by deepening debt, or have been discouraged from entering the field at all. Consequently, more of Maryland's rich farm acreage is for sale right now than at any other time in recent years. Due to rising land values and the shortage of farmers' capital, much of this land is being purchased for conversion to non-agricultural use. This accelerating shortage of farms, and therefore of farmers, if not reversed, will have serious consequences in the years ahead, as the demand for all commodities rises sharply in this area, in the Nation and throughout the world.

This summer I have traveled extensively throughout central and western Maryland, and have talked with countless farm groups and individuals about the immediate and long-range problems they face. These meetings have reaffirmed my conviction that bold leadership is necessary, now, both to reform present programs for immediate drought relief, and to develop new general policies to help American farmers become truly self-sufficient, so that no special crisis programs need be invoked in the future.

Mr. Speaker, at present there are four major programs of assistance to drought-stricken areas: the privilege of grazing or haying on diverted acreage; the privilege of purchasing surplus feed grains at lower prices; reductions in shipping fees for hay; and low-cost credit. These programs, which essentially offer only limited aid, have been hobbled by restrictive and inconsistent administration. Today, therefore, I am introducing legislation and recommending administrative actions to strengthen and

straighten out existing drought assistance. My suggestions are based on the overwhelming agreement of Maryland farmers that these programs, as presently operated, are ineffective and inequitable, and that certain reforms are necessary before "relief" efforts can actually help at all.

GRAZING PRIVILEGES

This program, the only one approved for any Maryland counties before September 2, permits farmers to graze their herds on crop hay before November 1 on acreage diverted from production under the four existing land diversion programs. While these privileges may be beneficial in theory, in practice two factors undermine their usefulness. First, obviously the diverted acreage has received no more rain this year, or in the last 5 years, than the rest of Maryland agricultural land, and much of what is supposedly "extra pasture land" has actually burned dry. Second, even where pasturing is feasible, the charging of fees for use of this land minimizes any gains which might otherwise be made.

While the establishment of fees for grazing or haying on diverted land is presently required by the Agriculture Department, it is not required by law under the conservation reserve program. These charges, while substantial from the point of view of hard-pressed farmers, are insignificant in the perspective of the multi-billion-dollar operations of the Department of Agriculture, and appear to be levied less for their revenue than for the sake of regulation.

I am therefore recommending to Secretary Freeman that these nuisance fees be abolished.

LIVESTOCK FEED PROGRAM

I regret that it is not possible yet to comment on the actual operation of this program in Maryland this year. Despite clear evidence that crops are scant and feed grains are in short supply, and despite the urgent requests of at least 11 county ASC committees and the certification of the State disaster committee, the livestock feed program has not yet been authorized.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment Secretary Freeman's arbitrary decision to withhold this assistance is based on several arguments, unsupported, and actually contradicted, by the facts. I have had extensive correspondence on these points with Secretary Freeman and his aids, and would like to include at this point the following three letters:

AUGUST 23, 1966.

DEAR Mr. MATHIAS: In response to your letter of August 17 asking for more drought assistance for Carroll and Frederick counties than that described in our letter of August 16, the Livestock Feed Program has not been authorized in any State or county this summer. Even though the oat and barley crops and later the corn crop may be reduced somewhat due to the drought, adequate supplies of feed grains should be available for sometime after harvest at reasonable prices. It is still too early to be certain what the corn crop will produce (including ensilage) if weather conditions should improve. However, if the Livestock Feed Program is prematurely approved in the meantime to make CCC stocks of feed grains available at reduced

prices, such action would definitely depress the price for farmers in Maryland who have these crops to market.

We believe conditions generally are not sufficiently acute to warrant initiating the Livestock Feed Program at this time. If the State and County USDA Disaster Committees determine that conditions have worsened, we would be glad to consider their recommendations at some appropriate later date.

We appreciate your calling our attention to this important matter. We will watch developments closely. We hope that the unfortunate livestockmen in the drought areas will be favored with badly needed rains before it is too late for 1966 crops and grazing.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT S. REED,
Assistant to the Secretary.

AUGUST 31, 1966.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Since receiving your assistant's letter of August 23, I have discussed his comments with a number of the leading farmers of drought-stricken areas.

The implied suggestion that Maryland farmers stage an Indian rain dance is hardly constructive under the present circumstances. The farmers I have consulted agree with me that, even as of August 23, when Mr. Reed wrote, any rain would have been "too late for 1966 crops and grazing." The Chairman of the Maryland ASC Committee did declare that "rains must come soon if they are to help this winter's feed supply," but that statement appeared in his Informational Letter of August 1. Early corn required rain at least five weeks ago; late corn, at least a week or two ago. Further, many farmers are cutting their corn right now, although it is immature, so that little corn will be left to receive any rain which may appear during the next few weeks. A decision by you now would help many in determining whether to chop corn for silos or keep it to pick.

The authorization to use diverted acreage for pasturing has proved to have very little value for most Maryland farmers. Obviously these lands have received no more rain this year, or in the last five years, than the rest of the agricultural acreage, and much of what is theoretically "extra pasture lands" has burned up. Even where some pasturing is possible, the fees charged for use of the land—fees which were not publicly mentioned prior to the granting of this "relief"—undercut any gains which might be made through this program.

The farmers with whom I have talked have raised serious questions about the assertion that "if the Livestock Feed Program is prematurely approved . . . such action would definitely depress the price for farmers in Maryland who have these crops to market." They have pointed out, first, that the market price of corn went up about a month ago, due to existing shortages and increased demand. Such higher prices for essential feed obviously undermine any remaining chance for profitable farming in Maryland this year. Since not all farmers will be eligible to receive surplus feed grains, the provision of these surpluses to some would help reduce market pressures and bring the price back to reasonable levels. Moreover, the price of surplus feed grains is not really much less than the customary market price, so that serious depression of the market price is highly improbable.

In general, I would urge you to reassess the value of existing drought assistance programs more realistically. In so doing, I hope you will bear in mind the fact that the prolonged drought has forced Maryland farmers to use grains for supplemental feed on a year-round basis. The problem now is far more acute and extended than one of simply insuring adequate winter feed.

It is my considered judgment that the entire Agriculture Department program of

drought assistance should be thoroughly reformed. Toward this end, I would be most happy to arrange a survey of conditions in the fields, and a discussion with representatives of Maryland farmers, for you and your assistants.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., September 9, 1966.

Hon. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MATHIAS: This is in reply to your letter of August 31, 1966, concerning the need for the Livestock Feed Program in the drought area of Maryland.

The Department is fully aware of the drought conditions which are so generally prevalent in Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. However, we still believe that conditions with respect to the availability of feed grains are not sufficiently acute to warrant a Livestock Feed Program at this time.

We recognize that livestock producers and dairymen would like to know whether the Livestock Feed Program will be authorized at some future date. This information is desirable in order that they can plan ahead. Most of our farm programs are announced in advance so that farmers can plan their future operation. However, the Livestock Feed Program cannot be announced prior to the time it has been determined that conditions have become sufficiently acute to warrant assistance.

We appreciate your interest in this matter and assure you that a close watch will be kept on conditions in the counties and further action will be taken if justified by the facts.

Sincerely yours,

H. D. GODFREY,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that Mr. Godfrey did not see fit either to respond to the points I made in my letter of September 1, or to offer additional arguments to support his contention that the situation is not yet serious enough to warrant approval of the livestock feed program. Since the State disaster committee, headed by the chairman of the Maryland ASC Committee, has recommended this aid, and since Washington officials, to my knowledge, have not made any field inspections of their own, I cannot understand their persistent rejection of the informed judgment of men on the scene.

Further, from past experience, Maryland farmers know that their problems will not end if the livestock feed program is eventually approved. Two administrative restrictions, resulting either from the rigidity or from the ambiguity of Agriculture Department regulations, have consistently irritated farmers and unduly complicated the provision of surplus feed grains.

First, section 3 of the act of September 21, 1959, provides that surplus feed grains be made available only to those farmers who, besides living in drought disaster areas, are unable to obtain adequate grain supplies "through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship." In some States local officials have interpreted this provision as requiring that, no matter how scarce commercial supplies may be, and no matter how high

the market price may have soared, individual farmers applying for aid must file a detailed financial statement. The determination as to whether "undue financial hardship" exists in every individual case is left to the respective county ASC committees, resulting in a wide variation of policies and criteria for eligibility, and placing divergent burdens of proof on both the farmers and the committeemen.

While I agree that surplus feed grains should not be handed out indiscriminately, it seems to me that, where an area has been declared a drought disaster area—especially for several successive years—farmers should not be forced to prove near-indigence to be eligible for special help. Therefore, I am introducing today a bill to repeal the "hardship" provisions of existing law.

The second problem is that the Agriculture Department has required that, where farmers purchase feed grains directly through county committees, payment must be made in cash at the time of purchase. This stipulation, which is not specified in law, seems to have been established simply for the administrative convenience of the Agriculture Department. Since farmers in drought-stricken areas are generally very short of cash, it seems obvious that county committees should be permitted and encouraged to extend reasonable short-term credit, for periods of perhaps 30 to 90 days, to farmers purchasing surplus feed grains. I am today urging the Secretary of Agriculture to grant this discretion.

SHIPMENT OF HAY

If feed grains are not available in a disaster area, and cannot be purchased in sufficient quantities from surplus stocks, obviously the farmer's only alternative is to buy grains from other areas. Under existing law, the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized to permit railroads to reduce freight rates for hauling hay into disaster areas. Clearly the farmer should be the real beneficiary of such rate reductions, but farmers have testified that this is not the case. Accordingly, I am today introducing a bill providing that, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reimburse farmers in drought disaster areas for one-half the cost of transporting hay by any common carrier to such areas from other areas approved by the Secretary.

LOW-COST CREDIT

In times of economic hardship, the farmer's greatest need is for funds with which to pay his operating costs and maintain his capital investment. Currently the Farmers Home Administration is authorized to make loans at 3 percent in designated disaster areas, but only to farmers who "are unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere to finance their actual needs at reasonable rates and terms." Like the definition of "hardship" under the livestock feed program, the administration of this restriction is left primarily to county committees and FHA agents, producing a wide range of definitions of "reasonable rates," and greatly varying criteria for proof of financial need. In some States and some

counties farmers must have evidence of actual credit rejection by commercial lenders. In other States and counties, no such requirement is enforced, so that both uniformity of interpretation and equity of treatment are lacking.

Recently a Frederick County farmer, protesting the rigidity of such requirements, wrote me that it should be "unnecessary for self-respecting farmers to be subjected to credit rejection before cheap money is made available for feed purchases." His comment, which I endorse completely, summarizes the false premises on which our drought disaster programs, and particularly the low-cost credit programs, are now based. Perhaps the key to USDA failures in this area is the Department's apparent equation of "drought relief" with "relief" in the welfare sense, rather than in the sense of temporary aid. But Maryland farmers do not want a dole, nor do they seek to become permanent wards of the Government. Rather, while Federal subsidy and control policies circumscribe their operations, and when extraordinary natural disasters make profitable farming impossible, they simply need temporary assistance, similar to the type provided to small businesses.

I suspect that, before truly appropriate and adequate assistance can be given to farmers in drought disaster areas, the Agriculture Department's entire attitude will have to be changed. As a first step, I am today asking Secretary Freeman to issue regulations which define the restrictions on FHA low-interest loans to make it unnecessary for individual farmers to suffer actual credit rejections, or for individual county agents to probe every detail of farmers' financial standing. Especially when, as now, commercial credit rates are high and loans are hard to obtain, it appears reasonable for the Department to establish guidelines which, perhaps by defining regions of tight credit, lift the burden of proof from the farmer and the burden of judgment from the county agent.

Second, as a long-range reform, I am calling upon the Department of Agriculture to provide alternate methods of providing the low-cost, long-term credit which drought-stricken farmers need. I am prepared to introduce legislation necessary for this purpose. A feasible step, which I will study in detail, might be to authorize the Farmers Home Administration to guarantee loans made through commercial sources and to pay all interest charges above a basic rate of perhaps 3 percent. I am asking Secretary Freeman to review this proposal without delay.

INSURANCE

The ultimate answer to the credit problem could be to establish a system of drought insurance for farmers. Obviously the actuarial difficulties involved are extensive, and require expert analysis before such a program could be implemented even on an experimental basis. Accordingly, I am today urging Secretary Freeman to initiate studies of the feasibility of augmenting the present limited crop insurance programs through

a new program of insurance not for specific crops, but for all major crops produced in geographical areas especially subject to prolonged and damaging drought. Such an advance would be in full accord with the basic purpose of the Federal crop insurance program, set forth in 7 U.S.C. 1502 as "to promote the national welfare by improving the economic stability of agriculture through a sound system of crop insurance and providing the means for the research and experience helpful in devising and establishing such insurance."

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, there are few signs that the persistent effects of the long northeastern drought will be ending soon. Even after normal year-round rainfall resumes, farmers will need assistance in recouping the losses they have suffered during the past 5 years. The rigid policies and attitudes of the Agriculture Department have so far failed to provide the aid that farmers seek, within the framework of the farmers' essential desire for economic self-sufficiency and independence. The current policies are ineffective, inefficient, and inequitable. They do not help the farmer's income, and they wound his dignity.

The legislation and administrative changes I have recommended today would be immediate steps on the road to reform. To summarize, today I am, first, asking Secretary Freeman to abolish the nuisance fees charged for use of diverted acreage in designated areas; second, introducing a bill to repeal the requirement that farmers in disaster areas may purchase surplus feed grains at reduced prices only if they cannot obtain needed supplies commercially without undue financial hardship; third, urging Secretary Freeman to permit county committees to extend short-term credit for purchase of surplus feed grains; fourth, introducing a bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to reimburse farmers in drought disaster areas for one-half the cost of shipping hay by any common carriers; fifth, asking Secretary Freeman to issue new regulations defining eligibility for low-cost FHA credit to remove the need for detailed and divergent "means tests" and proof of credit rejection; sixth, calling on the Agriculture Department to review alternate sources of low-cost, long-term credit, including possible loan guarantee programs; and seventh, urging Secretary Freeman to study the feasibility of a new crop insurance program covering all major crops produced in drought disaster areas.

These steps would be immediate advances toward effectiveness and equity in our drought-assistance programs. As I have indicated, far more basic changes are also necessary. I will continue to work for new general policies through which the American farmer can achieve his proper role as a full and free partner in American prosperity.

THE SAFETY OF THE PEOPLE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from California [Mr. UTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, Adm. Ben Moreell, former Chief of the Civil Engineer Corps of the U.S. Navy, and distinguished chairman of Americans for Constitutional Action, gave the commencement address to the graduating class of Grove City College, Grove City, Pa., on July 4 of this year.

In his remarks, which he entitled "The Safety of the People," this distinguished American addressed himself to one of the paramount problems of this unhappy age, the breakdown of order in all facets of our society.

Mr. Speaker, the prime function of any government is the maintenance of order and tranquility. Without these hallmarks of civilization, no nation can exist, much less progress. I commend Admiral Moreell's remarks to my colleagues, and insert his speech in the RECORD at this point:

THE SAFETY OF THE PEOPLE

(By Adm. Ben Moreell, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy (retired).)

In light of the turmoil and chaos which now enmesh our nation, at home and abroad, and the consequent bewilderment of our people, it is important to review our policies and practices over the past half century to determine, if we can, the causes of the current confusion.

Starting practically "from scratch," we became, in little over a century, the greatest nation in recorded history in terms of spiritual stature, individual freedom, material productivity, cultural progress, biblical charity and the security of our citizens and their property.

But, as we prospered, we lost sight of the fact that the blessings we enjoyed are not self-perpetuating, that they are premised on certain spiritual and cultural conditions which this generation did not create, which we inherited, and which we are losing! We are consuming our capital! That is the surest road to bankruptcy in business. And I am just as sure that our national well-being cannot outlast the current exhaustion of our spiritual and cultural capital!

THE HIGHER LAW

In his classic work, "De Legibus," Cicero, greatest of Rome's jurists and philosophers in the law, set forth this proposition:

"The safety of the people shall be the Highest Law."

That dictum stemmed from the concept that there is a Higher or Natural Law which transcends all man-made law. The idea originated with the ancient Greeks, was elaborated by Aristotle, and later adopted by the Stoics from whom it was taken over by Cicero and incorporated into the Roman law.

It was accepted by our Founding Fathers for inclusion in the Declaration of Independence, as evidenced by their avowed reliance on "the laws of Nature and of Nature's God" as sanction for their claim to that "separate and equal station—among the powers of the earth" to which a people is entitled when it becomes necessary—"to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another."

Professor Edward S. Corwin, noted scholar and teacher of jurisprudence, in his essay,

"The 'Higher Law' Background of American Constitutional Law," wrote:

"There are . . . certain principles of right and justice which are entitled to prevail of their own intrinsic excellence, altogether regardless of the attitude of those who wield the physical resources of the community. Such principles were made by no human hands . . . They are external to all will as such and interpenetrate all reason as such. They are eternal and immutable. In relation to such principles, human laws are . . . merely a record or transcript, and their enactment an act not of will or power but one of discovery and declaration."

Later, with respect to the 9th Amendment of the Constitution, which validates those rights of the people which are not specifically enumerated, he wrote:

"Such rights . . . owe nothing to their recognition in the Constitution. Such recognition was necessary if the Constitution was to be regarded as complete."

"Thus the legality of the Constitution, its supremacy, and its claim to be worshipped, alike find common standing ground on the belief in a law superior to human governors."

That concept was endorsed by the late President Hoover in his address to the 1956 Republican National Convention. He said:

"Those great documents of 180 years ago from our Founding Fathers must still be the foundation of our American way of life . . .

"I have faith that there are principles which neither Communism, nor Socialism, nor neutralism, nor other evil ideas, nor even the march of time, can defeat. Those truths came into the world along with the shooting stars of which worlds are made. They are as inevitable as the existence of the Supreme Being, the forces of gravity, and the ceaseless struggle of mankind to be free."

LIMITS FOR MAN-MADE LAW

Those "principles of right and justice" fix the limits within which man-made law must function if we are to avoid doing violence to the higher law of nature.

The Declaration defined those limits as follows:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure those rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute new government . . ."

The preliminary drafts of the Declaration and contemporary documents make clear that the phrase "all men are created equal" was intended to denote equality before God and before the law, not an impossible equality of natural talents and consequent equality of material possessions. Similarly, it was intended that all men should be free to pursue happiness, the responsibility for catching up with it remaining with the pursuer. Happiness, per se, is not a natural right but something to be earned by individual effort, a concept which differs materially from that of "The Great Society" zealots who now steer our Ship of State.

Those basic principles were to establish the framework for a "government of laws and not of men." Our Central Government was to be one of strictly limited powers, specified in a written constitution. Furthermore, those powers were to be augmented, extended, eliminated, reduced or re-distributed only by the procedures prescribed in the Constitution itself, not by judicial interpretation, legislative mandate, executive decree nor by arbitrary seizure which has no legislative sanction but is based on the theory that certain undefined powers inhere

naturally in the presidency. All of these devices have been used in recent years by power-hungry and impatient government officials to rationalize their violations of constitutional prohibitions and limitations on their authority.

The texts of the Declaration and the Constitution, the debates in the Constitutional Conventions, in the Congress and in the State legislatures, as well as contemporary records, notably the sermons of the colonial clergy, indicate general agreement that broadly speaking, the functions of the Central Government should be limited to the following:

1. Protection of the citizens' lives, limbs, liberties and livelihoods, that is, their honestly acquired property, against aggression from without and internal disorder;
2. Dispensation of equal justice under law; and
3. Keeping the records incident thereto.

Other than these, the people were to be free to pursue their own interests, provided this did not lead them to trespass on the rights of others.

It was held that such limitations on government powers could be effective only in a social order where there is a generally prevailing concept of the nature of the universe and how it is ordered, and the nature of man and his place in that universe; that concept being defined as follows:

1. Man has inherent and inalienable rights, bestowed on him by God, which are in conformity with universally valid and eternal moral laws;

2. All just government powers are derived from the citizens by voluntary delegation;

3. To avoid trespassing on the individual's rights, there must be a free market for goods, services and ideas, into which government must not intrude except to protect those rights; and

4. For every natural right there are collateral responsibilities and moral duties, imposed on the individual, to make his conduct conform to the code set forth in such stern admonitions as The Ten Commandments, The Sermon On The Mount and The Golden Rule.

On this foundation, our people erected the structure of a great social order which, until recent decades, stood as a beacon of hope for the future of all mankind.

SQUANDERING OUR LEGACY

How well have we managed this heritage? I believe my generation has squandered its legacy. We have permitted the superstructure of this citadel of freedom to be ravaged and its foundations eroded to the point where there is danger of total collapse.

Our intense pursuit of profit and pleasure left little time or inclination to reflect on the dismal records of some great civilizations of the past, best exemplified by the tragic decline and fall of the Roman Empire. This debacle resulted when "the safety of the people" was no longer revered as "the highest law" but had given way to ruthless competition for political or economic power, an essential feature of which was corruption of the people by ever-increasing government largesse in the form of food, clothing, shelter, entertainment, "bread and circuses." These were the prototypes of our present-day multi-faceted "war on poverty," publicly-financed stadiums, playgrounds, recreation areas, theatres, cultural centers, and a myriad of other "Great Society" subventions.

All of us must share the blame for this betrayal of our trust. Several years ago in a public address I reproached our National legislators for their seduction of the people by government "hand-outs." I received a letter from a prominent Senator, a friend of long standing, in which he said, "Don't be too hard on us. We give you the kind of government you demand . . . or will tolerate."

Over the past fifty years we have propagated a child-like faith in the competence of government to achieve any kind of material, economic, social or moral purpose. Implementing this faith we have stood by, meekly, while government seized authority at an ever-increasing pace, centralizing it in Washington, where it would be shielded from the scrutiny of those from whom it had been taken; and this is always done under the pretext that it is solely for the good of the people!

But even more destructive is the fact that, as government functions today, decisions on matters of vital import to the security and well-being of our nation are most frequently taken in light of their probable political effects, rather than being based on purely economic, social or national security considerations.

It has been said that the people never give up their liberties except under some delusion. In this case the delusion is that government which, after all, is operated by ordinary mortals like you and me, not by gods or supermen, has some superior competence in the realm of economics, some mysterious magic multiplier of wealth, some power to open the doors to a vast store of economic goods which can be had without working for them, merely by voting for them!

Few of us are completely immune to such delusions, or to the human passions which they arouse, apathy, fear, greed and violence. But those who see the terminus of this "devil's highway" are duty bound to sound the alarm.

Let us look briefly at some areas where we have departed from our time-tested principles, and thus jeopardized "the safety of the people."

THE EVILS OF INFLATION

Perhaps most obvious is the debauchery of our currency. Largely as the result of profligate spending and shiftless fiscal and monetary policies, at home and abroad, our gold reserve, intended to insure national solvency and to promote dynamic economic equilibrium, has been depleted to the point where our government resorts to frantic maneuvers in the international money marts to avoid devaluation of the dollar.

Our maudlin foreign aid programs have served principally to buttress unstable authoritarian and socialist governments, to line the pockets of dictators and their henchmen and to subsidize cutthroat foreign competition with our own industries.

Our public debt is at an all-time high and increases each year. In addition, there are hidden obligations accumulated under the social security and government retirement systems, and as guarantees of mortgages and other indebtedness, which amount to hundreds of billions, the total of Central Government liabilities alone having been estimated recently at 1½ trillion dollars, that is, \$1500 billions, or \$7500.00 for every man, woman and child in the nation!

The debts of States, subordinate units of government, and public "authorities," as well as private indebtedness have kept pace with that of the Central Government. Our nation is mortgaged to the hilt! And the process continues. Unbalanced national budgets have become a way of life. During the past five years the National Budget has averaged an annual deficit of \$6.3 billions. Since 1939 inflation has reduced the purchasing power of our dollar to about 43 cents, with commensurate decreases in purchasing power of the peoples' savings accounts, pensions, insurance policies, annuities and other fixed income investments.

Increases in the costs of replacing obsolete industrial equipment and for new equipment to expand production reflect the current inflation. These, together with our subsidization of foreign industries, have impaired our ability to compete in the world's

markets, including even those of our own country, and thus to provide decent jobs for a rapidly growing working population.

The "New Deal" strategists conferred on the late President Hoover the politically-motivated distinction of having caused single-handedly, a world-wide depression which they magnanimously named after him! But even if their arguments had the slightest validity, compared to the fiscal achievements of the various Deals, Frontiers and Societies which followed him, Mr. Hoover was a mere novice!

Several years ago the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy published an analysis which showed that losses in purchasing power of the people's savings arising from the depreciation of our dollar during the periods 1939 to 1959 and 1960 were 122 times the loss of \$1,901,000,000 of deposits in banks for the years 1921-1933. This includes the period of the New Deal's misnamed "Hoover Depression!" The culprit responsible for these huge inflationary losses is the agency that creates dollars out of thin air and pumps them into our economic blood-stream with no off-setting increases in goods and services available for purchases. This agency is our own out-of-bounds government. During the past five years our purchasing media (currency and checking accounts) have increased at an annual rate of more than 6%, the highest for any such period since World War II. And the rate is increasing; the rate during the past year being 8.9%.

But the harsh realities of politics will not permit government to admit its guilt. So government looks for a scape-goat, preferably one who will be a politically profitable whipping boy. In this case it is private industry, whose managers have tried earnestly to protect their owners' properties against inflationary erosions by proposing modest increases in the prices of their products.

The government propaganda machine is then turned on full-force in an effort to delude our people into believing that private industry is not the unfortunate victim of inflation but is the greedy villain who caused it!

Initially inflation weighs most heavily on the thrifty citizens who, largely through fixed income investments, have tried to provide a competence for their old age or security for their loved ones. But, eventually, it involves the entire nation. The resultant chaos can be ended only by dictatorship and ruthless suppression of the rights of the people. A dictator has been defined as the receiver for a nation gone bankrupt!

I have dwelt at some length on this subject because debauchery of the currency is so pervasive that, ultimately, no one can entirely escape its destructive effects. Our government, whose fiscal and monetary policies and practices induce inflation, stands guilty of flagrant violation of that highest law—the safety of the people!

THE CRISIS OF MORALS

Not unrelated to the debauchery of our currency is the national crisis of morals and moral courage.

Our national crime rates, notably crimes of violence, are skyrocketing, as are the rates of divorce, juvenile delinquency, illegitimate births and family desertions. There are all-too-frequent evidences of corruption in high places in public and private life. We are demoralized by an apathetic acceptance of low standards of conduct of prominent persons and of the general public; an increasing tolerance of openly flaunted pornography in the theatre, books, periodicals, recordings, movies and television; the deterioration of family life; derision of religion and spiritual values; and downgrading of the individual as a responsible creature of God, sovereign in his natural rights, having per-

sonal worth and dignity, deserving of respect because he is self-respecting and respectable.

Our situation is more precarious because we do not receive support from those to whom we look for help. We urge people to go back to church; but there they frequently find that the forces which have undermined our traditional beliefs have infected the very source of those beliefs, the church itself!

Many of our prominent and articulate churchmen and some of our most influential church bodies favor socialization of our national life and urge that more power be placed in the hands of government. Others have sought to make the churches over into a political force to put pressure on legislators. Many to whom we look for guidance out of the morass of materialism and State-imposed humanism appear to have "made a deal" for a partnership between God and Caesar, with God cast in the role of very junior partner.

Others assert with the assurance born of ignorance that "God is dead, and man has inherited His throne" . . . weak, witless, sinful man, frequently unable to resolve the problems of his own small household, but supremely confident of his competence to plan and direct the orderly functioning of the Cosmos!

I have long believed that personal example is the most powerful element of effective leadership, for good or for evil. A fair reading of the record leads to the conclusion that, in its role of Robin Hood, our giant government has provided the worst kind of moral leadership for our people. Robin Hood may have been impelled by the most altruistic of motives—but he was still a thief! Today the "powers that be" neatly gloss over the fact that when people vote for legislators who promise them "goodies" at the expense of those who worked to produce them, they become partners with government in thievery! More's the pity that such legalized larceny has the sanction of many high government officials who urge the voters to "come and get it!"

Many politicians now run for office on the platform, "I can get more from the government for you." But they do not mention what government must first take from you and others who produced the wealth. President Johnson had at least the virtue of frankness when he stated, "We are going to take from those who have and give it to the have-nots."

In a recent detailed study of socialist Sweden, commenting on public housing, the author wrote: "Here, as well as in other spheres, personal corruption and indifference to laws are the results of State intervention in the functioning of the free market economy."

CIVIL RIGHTS AND MORAL WRONGS

Our social order is subjected to massive stress as government seeks to impose legal curbs on freedom to use or dispose of one's property and the right to choose one's associates. Justifying the means they propose by the ends they seek, public officials and prominent private citizens, including many of our clergy, encourage violation of those laws which one does not like, as well as civil disobedience merely for its nuisance value, and illegal seizures of private property. All such acts constitute trespass on the rights of others and are "civil wrongs!" They point the way to anarchy and, ultimately, to dictatorship!

Our judiciary frequently shows excessive concern for the civil liberties of hardened criminals at the expense of the moral and legal rights of their innocent victims. Similar tolerance is displayed toward union officials who order or condone acts of violence on persons and property by their subordinates.

We appear to have reached the point where the only license we need for the perpetra-

tion of civil wrongs on a law-abiding and peaceful citizenry or for the obstruction of lawful commerce is willingness to join a picket line and carry a placard with a legend which heaps abuse on those who have incurred our displeasure!

Giant Government in Washington grows at the expense of State sovereignty and individual rights. The Central Government now owns more than 34% of the land area within the boundaries of the fifty States, it owns and operates more than 3000 tax-free commercial activities in competition with its own citizens, it dispenses more than 25% of the national income and it grows apace! Such massive intrusions into the affairs of the once Sovereign States and of the people, many clearly in violation of the Constitution, impair economic freedom, discourage prudent venture capital, impede development of private enterprise and compromise the safety of the people.

We appear to be suffering a paralysis of will which saps our courage, moral and physical. We are being transmuted from a God-fearing, energetic, self-reliant, confident and venturesome people, free and independent, into a nation of timid dependents, insecure, apprehensive, fearful of incurring the displeasure and reprisals of our political masters to whom we are told to look for food, clothing, shelter, medical care, education, entertainment and security from the cradle to the grave. And to receive those bounties, we need only surrender control of our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor!

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

The emotions which paralyze our wills in domestic affairs have infected our courage and integrity when dealing with other nations. On the international scene, compromise of principle, appeasement of blustering bullies, support of cruel oppressors, intervention of the internal affairs of friendly nations and surrender to blackmail, mark our conduct. Moral principle is sacrificed on the altar of expediency to achieve the promise of a dubious security. Any dictator who wishes to rub our nose in the dirt for political profit or personal pleasure does so with impunity, secure in the knowledge that when he is ready to trade we will buy him off with generous allocations of foreign aid.

Little wonder, then, that Khrushchev was quoted as having remarked on his return from his trip to America, "You spit in their faces and they smilingly wipe it away and say 'The dew is very heavy today.'"

In the Vietnam war it appears that we are exerting every effort to avoid achieving a clear-cut victory in order to induce the communists to come to the bargaining table where the first installment of a generous payoff, budgeted at one billion dollars, awaits them! While the arrogant aggressor is leisurely making up his mind, we continue pouring men and materiel into the venture! Here one must ask, "What's wrong with victory, since victory is the only sure way to end both the aggression and the drain on our human and material resources? And if victory is politically inexpedient why not withdraw and end the bloodletting and the waste?"

We are not respected by our enemies, by the so-called neutrals, nor by our professed friends. In spite of generous concessions in all areas, "Yankee Go Home" has become an international slogan. Unruly mobs, unrestricted by police or other public authorities, attack our embassies, legations, consulates, libraries and other installations and menace the safety of our representatives.

To show our complete confidence in the honor of dictators who have repeatedly repudiated their treaty obligations, our government has proposed a long-range program for total disarmament of all nations, in which we are now taking the lead, unilaterally.

I am under no illusion. I know that a Jeremiah is without honor, especially in his own country, when the people become servile and insensitive to moral wrongs under the narcotic effects of a false prosperity, buttressed by massive government seductions and propaganda. But those who feel, as I do, that the safety of the people is in jeopardy are morally bound to say so.

THE WAY AHEAD

Is there a way ahead which will take us out of this morass? Is there a way to recover the sanity and balance which once marked our life? I am sure there is, if we are willing to pay the price. But it is not by resort to political legerdemain. It is by beating our way upstream, against the swift-running current, to those moral and spiritual values upon which this nation was built. We must be born again of the spirit!

I do not mean to imply that there are no problems peculiar to the economic and political levels of our national life. But if men are not right at the deeper level, in their understanding of the nature of the universe and man's position therein, they can tinker with economic and political problems from now until doomsday and still come up with the wrong answers.

It is a case of putting first things first and the very first thing is a rehabilitation of our basic moral principles. Such an effort on our part will call forth the support of cosmic sanction, for God intended men to be free. "The God Who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time," Jefferson observed. But we will need conviction, courage, tenacity, understanding, humility, compassion and, above all, faith, to set in motion what William James called "... those tiny invisible, molecular moral forces which work from individual to individual, creeping in through the crannies of the world like so many soft rootlets, or like the capillary oozing of water, but which, if you give them time, will rend the hardest monuments of man's pride."

That is the way! May our Father in Heaven endow us with wisdom, strength and courage to follow it! Our forebears did so under more oppressive conditions than those we face. We can do it too, provided only that we have the will! That is your challenge and your opportunity! I pray you will make this your post-graduate mission and, if this be your resolve, that you will translate it into action that counts. St. James said: "... Who so looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE INSPECTION SERVICE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture in the July 21 Federal Register announced a proposed change in their regulations. This change would make it possible for the Department to withdraw inspection service from any processing plant in the event that any employee attempted to interfere with the inspector, particularly interference by improper means.

In an effort to defeat this proposal, I today submitted the following statement

to the Subcommittee on Dairy and Poultry of the Committee on Agriculture.

I was informed a few minutes ago that the Department is recalling this proposed regulation:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD H. CALLAWAY BEFORE THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, DAIRY AND POULTRY SUBCOMMITTEE, SEPTEMBER 21, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit the following statement covering my views on the proposed regulation 81.25(a)(1)(iv) by the Department of Agriculture, which in my opinion raises some very serious legal and public interest problems.

In the beginning, I would like to emphasize that violence between poultry plant employees and respected federal inspectors cannot be condoned. Employees who engage in such violence should be severely disciplined. In proposing this "anti-violence" regulation 81.25(a)(1)(iv), however, the Department has taken an unnecessary approach to the problem. Assault and battery are violations of the criminal laws in every state. If the Department of Agriculture wants to protect its inspectors and deter acts of violence in the future, it can accomplish both these objectives by initiating criminal proceedings in the state courts.

This regulation penalizes innocent parties, who are in no way responsible for the violence. Dozens of employees could be laid-off, and hundreds of farmers suffer, because of an improper act of a single employee. The employee may suffer an extensive economic damage despite the fact that he may have been incapable of preventing the trouble.

The vagueness of this regulation is also cause for concern. A plant can be closed down because an employer "attempted to interfere ... by improper means" with a federal inspector. What, exactly, are improper means? How is one to distinguish between interference and a vigorous exchange of views?

In addition, there is nothing in this regulation that requires suspension orders to be terminated after a reasonable period of time. A plant may be closed down indefinitely without giving the employer an opportunity to present his views or to rectify the situation.

The proposed regulation appears to be another gimmick to disturb and harass by threat a self-sustaining industry. Since the people of my State of Georgia are very proud of our number one position in the production, processing, and shipping of poultry, I have a very positive interest in this matter.

Because of advanced techniques and facilities, this industry has been able to prosper and yet maintain an economical product for the family dinner table, this at a time when we are suffering the worst inflationary spiral in our country's history. The closing of a plant for a week could not only work hardship on dozens of plant workers, but in addition hundreds of farmers would also be hurt, which in turn could also affect the economy of an entire community.

The people of my state are approaching the "breaking point" on Washington directives which affect our educational systems, health problems, public highways, and our right to enjoy the blessings of free enterprise, self-reliance, and self-discipline within the laws of the land.

For a long time, much too long, "entrenched officialdom" in Washington have sought to distort the will of the Congress of the United States. As one of its proud Members, I believe the time has come to "lock the door" on any further intrusions into the private and economic lives of our people. These intrusions go far beyond the letter and the intent of the legislation which was enacted.

The regulation before the subcommittee is another prime example of this invasion into the realm of threat, duress, and punishment by the social dreamers and Great Society conformists who are trying constantly to usurp the prerogatives belonging to our state and local units of government.

For the above reasons, I urge that the proposed regulation be forgotten.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE AUTOMATIC INCREASES IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS WHEN INFLATION JUSTIFIES IT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for an automatic cost-of-living increase in the insurance benefits payable thereunder.

Today persons currently receiving benefits, or eligible to do so on retirement make up about four-fifths of the total population over 65 and as much as 90 to 95 percent of the population now reaching 65. For most beneficiaries, the social security benefit is a major source of income during the retirement period. For many it is the only source. According to a 1963 study prepared by the Social Security Administration, the benefit was practically the sole source of cash income for nearly one-fifth of the beneficiary couples and for more than one-third of the nonmarried beneficiaries who had been entitled to benefits for a year or more.

To the lower income families, social security is especially important. Benefits contributed 85 percent or more of the income of beneficiaries with total money income below \$1,000 in 1962; even for those with income of \$2,000 to \$2,999, the benefit accounted for 59 percent of the couple's income and for 42 percent of the income of the nonmarried beneficiaries.

Of the 18 million people now 65 and older, significant proportions receive income too low to permit independent living by any reasonable standard. Social security benefit payments help to meet this problem, but inflation and the rising cost of living threatens even this position. The Congress has not been entirely unmindful of the impact of cost-of-living increases on these pensioners and has periodically increased them. But between these sporadic increases there has usually been a timelag of several years during which the pensioners have suffered drops in their purchasing power. For example, from 1958 through 1964, just before the 7-percent increase in pensions was legislated, inflation cost social security pensioners approximately \$1.4 billion in loss of purchasing power.

An automatic increase in social security benefits correlated to increases in the consumer price index involves no increase in costs as a level percentage of payroll. Wage increases usually precede

increases in the other components comprising the consumer price index. Increases in the wage level bring more covered workers nearer the maximum social security wage base and thus result in increased tax revenues. Additionally, the benefits paid represent a smaller proportion of an individual's wages as his wages approach the maximum wage limit—\$6,600. Because of these factors there is no increase in the level cost of payroll—although there is an increased flow of dollars—involved in enacting an automatic benefit increase provision. The additional funds necessary for financing these things will come from general revenue.

There is an urgent need for such a change in the law. The desirability of raising social security benefits in order to meet the rising cost of living has long been recognized. Adoption of my bill would mean that the delay between the incidents of inflation and congressional action would be greatly shortened, so that those on social security would not be handicapped by reduced purchasing power.

This proposal as I have outlined it has the support of over half the Republican Members of the House and has been endorsed by the Republican coordinating committee. Several foreign countries, including Belgium, France, Luxemburg, Netherlands, and Sweden have adopted the automatic cost of living increases in their programs with great success.

A BILL TO ASSURE THE RIGHT OF TEACHERS TO DEDUCT EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to make it clear that teachers may deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education. I have consistently urged that section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—relating to trade or business expenses—should be properly construed to allow a deduction for expenses for education necessary for maintaining and improving employment. Unfortunately, rather than give a broad interpretation to this section through the regulations, the IRS has chosen instead to increasingly narrow its application. Current regulations now limit deductions from gross income for educational expenses in those limited circumstances where an individual must take educational courses in order to maintain his job. No deduction is allowed for educational expenses to prepare an individual for a better job. Furthermore, regulations have recently been proposed which would limit deductions allowable under section 162 still further to exclude ex-

penses for courses which lead toward an academic degree—even if the courses are necessary for maintaining present employment.

The bill I am introducing today would serve to reverse this backward trend in IRS interpretation specifically in one important area—expenses for the education of teachers. Because of the severe teacher shortage in the country it is essential that immediate action be taken with regard to it.

I would also urge the proper and updated interpretation of section 162 regarding expenses paid for the upgrading of all skills and programs through adult education of all sorts be made. It is time that some better coordination be effected between our tax policies and our expenditure policies. We are faced today with the anomalous situation of having the Federal Government expending large sums of money for education and training designed to reduce unemployment and improve the standard of living of lower income groups, while at the same time maintaining—and now talking of increasing—tax barriers which discourage people from spending these sums themselves to upgrade their skills.

ADMINISTRATION'S BIG SECRET: RULES FOR WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS ARE ALREADY DRAFTED

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the groundwork is being laid for a gigantic step forward in the plans for totally controlling American business and labor activities. We have watched a steady attrition of our free-enterprise freedoms but the worst is yet to come. The rent supplement program, medicare program, and demonstration city programs will be pedestrian compared to the administration's plan to control wages and prices.

The respected journalist, Ralph DeToledano has written an excellent article which outlines what the administration has in store. Yes; they will probably wait until after the election. However, the electorate should not be fooled. The article should be read by every concerned American:

ADMINISTRATION'S BIG SECRET: RULES FOR WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS ARE ALREADY DRAFTED
(By Ralph de Toledano)

When Americans go to the polls in November they will be voting on a variety of complex and important issues. But the one closest to their daily lives and their economic well-being will be a secret to them—or so the Administration hopes.

That issue is wage-price controls, freezing salaries and prices for the duration of the Vietnamese war. This could mean 10 years of a regulated economy in which hard work and skill will go unrewarded because the federal government has put a clamp on initiative.

In 1946 the voters tossed out the Democrats and elected a Republican Congress be-

cause they were fed up with wage-price restrictions on their daily lives. In 1952 they elected a Republican President and Congress because they wanted no more of what the Korean War was doing to their daily lives.

Yet the Johnson Administration is making careful plans at this very moment for imposing controls on the American people, once the November election is over.

This is not scare talk or rumor. Working secretly at the White House, the Office of Emergency Planning—a group few Americans know anything about—has already drafted the regulations and drawn the blueprints for the imposition of wage and price controls. The OEP has not merely sketched in some general plans for a possible eventuality. For months it has been working out every detail for a freeze on wages and prices, and for a return of rationing.

The White House will deny this, and Administration spokesmen argue that wage-price controls are the last thing President Johnson wants. But it has been unable to keep a lid on the work of the OEP. And in preparing the stage for this drastic new move to "curb inflation," it has tipped its hand by rounding up support for the emergency measures it hopes to announce early in December. President George Meany of the AFL-CIO, a fervent opponent of any system which will prevent his unions from stepping up their wage demands, has already moved to soften opposition by pledging full acquiescence to the Administration's scheme.

The biggest giveaway, however, comes from Capitol Hill, where Republican investigators have discovered that the White House has already selected a printer for the ration books that will be required if the OEP's plans go into effect. Key Republican congressmen are preparing to take the voters in on this discovery at the opportune time. They have chapter and verse and may even be able to produce a copy of the ration books.

If the story breaks—and if the White House does not succeed in suppressing wide dissemination of the Republican charges—the OEP's plans will do more to arouse the electorate than the Vietnamese war and its dawdling progress. For this reason the Administration will do everything in its power to stifle disclosure of its plans and the likelihood is that the press will join in the silence at the President's request.

But wage-price controls and rationing are not needed to curb the present inflation. Nor will they strike at the two factors most damaging to the national economy—high interest rates which are depriving Americans of necessary housing and the steady deterioration of a stock market which holds the investments and savings of some 20 million Americans.

The Vietnamese war is not draining off that much of the gross national product. Nor is there a demand for goods so great that the Administration's excessively harsh measures are required.

President Johnson, however, has drifted so long—refusing to act because of possible political consequences in November—that he is ready to try almost anything.

His biggest worry is the attitude of the Western European nations, most of them enjoying unprecedented prosperity. They have informed him, through their ambassadors in Washington, that a continuation of America's unique "inflationary deflation"—or is it "deflationary inflation"?—can drag down their economy and push the world into another 1929 situation.

Their applause, when former President Truman made the same analysis of America's financial and economic troubles, was heartfelt. Mr. Johnson, however, sees politics in any critical word spoken about him or his Administration. He is much more prone to listen to the advice of his Office of Emergency Planning than to the world's leaders.

And the OEP is calling for wage-price controls and rationing. All the President has to do is press a button—and this, the most reliable sources in Washington predict, is exactly what he'll do once the November votes are in.

THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that is overwhelmingly certain it is that, in the minds of the vast majority of Americans, the House Committee on Un-American Activities—HCUA—needs no defending. Very few thinking Americans believe that we do not need the committee on which I am privileged to serve as the ranking minority member. Very few Members of Congress feel that we do not need our committee.

It goes without saying, of course, that the Communists and their frontiers and satellites are at the forefront of those who clamor for the abolition of HCUA. Rightly so, if they were not we would certainly feel that we are failing in our jobs. Whenever Communists meet, one of their major topics is, "How do we abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities?" Top-ranking Communists from more than 20 countries met in Liblice, Czechoslovakia, near Prague, in May of 1962 to outline their world strategy to destroy the capitalist enemy and spread their godless doctrine throughout the world. Under the title, "Anti-Communism, Enemy of Mankind," they have published their proceedings in 18 languages. They cited the seven steps which were "essential" to their ultimate victory. The fourth reads, in part: "abolition of the House Un-American Committee."

They have been working toward this goal for 20 years and they feel they are making progress. They measure progress in the riots they can provoke when HCUA meets and the naivete of people who succumb to their emotional arguments.

This presentation is made with the idea in mind of answering many of the charges which have come from those who would abolish HCUA. Many honorable and non-Communist Americans also want HCUA abolished. Time does not permit a blow-by-blow account of those who are against and their backgrounds. This will be the subject of another compilation at a future date. For now I believe it is better to give answers to the many charges which have been made, so fewer people will be gullible in swallowing the anti-HCUA line. We can worry about refuting the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, the National Committee To Abolish the Un-

American Activities Committee, the Women Strike for Peace, and others later. Suffice it to say that within these groups there are those who are genuine and those who as Communists have a special ax to grind. I have always been able to understand the Communists, Mr. Speaker, but the motives of the so-called liberals have always left me wondering.

It is often said that the days of subversion are over and we do not need an investigating committee any more. Nothing could be further from the truth. Subversion and Communist penetration of all facets of American life continue. On June 22 of this year I entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD extensive remarks on continuing Communist subversion in the United States, copies of which can be obtained through my office. Reference was made to cases in which American citizens teamed up with Soviet officials to steal classified information for the benefit of the Soviet Union. Also included was a listing of Soviet nationals who were declared persona non grata and tossed out of the country for their part in these espionage cases. The subversion and espionage activity in which Soviet officials have been involved recently should be a shocker to those who are truly concerned about the security of our country.

From 1960 through 1965, 21 Russian nationals representing the U.S.S.R. here in the United States have been declared persona non grata for their subversive activities.

During this period the United States, through its courts, has meted out two life sentences for spying for the Soviet Union. During this period U.S. courts have dealt out a total of 170 years in prison terms to nine persons convicted of violations of the espionage statutes, most of whom were Americans owing allegiance to this Nation.

In my experience on the committee, there has always been a valid reason for our investigations whether it be those hearings relating to Cuban travel, the industrial colonization of Communists to bore from within our basic enterprises or the celebrated case of Dr. Jeremiah Stamler in Chicago. The latter represents a case that, like many others, offers a direct challenge to our constitutionality. Rarely are all of the facts understood by those who shout accusations at our committee. In the case of Dr. Stamler, many facets of this hearing have not been presented because he chose to risk a contempt citation by refusing to even be sworn rather than face the questions we had ready to propound. Consider just one angle of this hearing. Dr. Stamler and his coworker, Yolanda Hall, have backgrounds which, our evidence shows, include Communist activities. Dr. Stamler is a research scientist. An official publication of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shows fiscal 1963 grants for research projects. Included on page 96 are two grants to Dr. Stamler for hypertensive and atherosclerotic diseases and a feasibility study—diet and heart disease. The amount involved is \$282,580 of taxpayers' money. Research is somewhat different from defense procurement. If you

give Boeing a contract for \$10 million, you expect to get a plane or two in return. On research it cannot be told to the scientist on January 1, 1967, "We gave you \$282,580 so now give us the answer to cancer, heart disease, or whatever you are researching." Who can argue that we should not know if this money is truly going to research or whether it is finding its way into other hands and other causes.

I merely point this out because our committee is one which deals with hostile areas and we rarely are able to point out exactly what we will uncover.

We are basically an investigating committee. We have watchdog functions over the internal security laws of our land. A great amount of what we do is accomplished quietly, without the glare of publicity. It is safe to say that most of our recommendations result in changes in procedures or regulations at the executive level rather than in new laws. A recent spy case illustrates this point:

MARTIN AND MITCHELL CASE

One of the most appalling and shocking revelations to come on the scene in recent years was the defection of Bernon Mitchell and William Martin to the Soviet Union. These two men were employed by the National Security Agency with access to highly classified information. The NSA, of course, is the Government's supersecret code and communications arm. The committee instituted an extensive investigation of the circumstances surrounding the defection, together with a thorough and detailed examination of the personnel security regulations and procedures in effect at the time of defection, and of subsequent measures taken by the Agency to resolve any weaknesses in its procedures. A detailed report of the investigation, titled "Security Practices in the National Security Agency," was released by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in August of 1962.

The report pointed out appalling defects in this, the most sensitive security organization in our Government, which seriously affected the integrity of the U.S. Government and its people in their life and death struggle with the international Communist conspiracy. It is my contention that the House Committee on Un-American Activities' investigation into the personnel security practices of the National Security Agency has proven to be one of the most worthwhile and constructive undertakings in the history of the committee for it has resulted in sweeping reforms. Not only were two top officials removed, but 26 employees were dismissed as sex deviates and 22 basic reforms in NSA security procedures were instituted. In addition, H.R. 950, which amends the Internal Security Act of 1950, making sweeping reforms in personnel security procedures in the National Security Agency, was introduced and passed the House on May 9, 1963 by a vote of 340 to 40. This case could well serve as a model for proper cooperation between Government agencies and legislative committees.

Hundreds of other examples could be cited. As I stated before, however, the committee hardly needs defending. Its

case comes best in the answers which have been prepared to the allegations made against HCUA. These have been compiled from statements made by myself and Chairman Ed WILLIS as well as research by Staff Director Francis McNamara and HCUA Counsel Al Nittle. George Armstrong and Dave Richardson of my own staff provided valuable help. I feel these answers, many of which have been drafted in rebuttal to a petition offered by the committee calling for abolition of HCUA, can be used by an informed public and I compiled them for that reason.

ALLEGATION NO. 1

The committee's "sole power" is to investigate "un-American propaganda activities" and "subversive and un-American propaganda." The committee is thus limited to inquiring into "ideas, opinions, speech, and other forms of expression."

REPLY

This allegation is completely without foundation. The courts have flatly rejected it. More important, it has been contradicted over and over again by the House itself, and it is the House which, under the Constitution, has the authority to define and interpret the duties of its committees.

This committee was created as a special committee of the House on May 26, 1938. On that day, during the debate on the resolution to create the committee, there was extensive discussion about what the resolution empowered the committee to do. The very first statement about the nature, purpose and scope of the authority contained in the resolution was made early in the debate by Mr. Dies, who was subsequently chosen to be the first chairman of the committee. Mr. Dies said:

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as it shows on its face, is for the purpose of investigating un-American activities.¹

Member after Member spoke on the subject. While the words "propaganda" and "propaganda activities" were used a few times in the 2-hour debate, the vast majority of statements, including those made by the opponents of the resolution—who were very much in the minority—clearly indicated that the Members intended the committee to investigate not only propaganda activities, but of all kinds of activities which were subversive and un-American in nature.

Mr. Dies was asked, for example, whether the resolution was broad enough to authorize the investigation of foreign propaganda aimed at embroiling this country in foreign wars. In response, he said in part:

I am sure that the committee could legitimately go into the question as to the amount of funds spent for propaganda purposes in the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK, the present distinguished Speaker of the House, who had chaired a special committee established

in 1934 to investigate Nazi and other subversive activities, made the following statement about what the committee should be authorized to investigate.

There should be included the activities of foreign agencies in the United States seeking to mold public opinion or to form group action, not for the purpose of the overthrow of the Government, but for the purpose of influencing the domestic or the external policies of our Government. Such activities are equally subversive of our institutions.

Not a single Member of the House objected to Mr. McCORMACK's statement. The present Speaker of the House then went on to urge Mr. Dies to accept his—the Speaker's—and another Member's suggestions relating to the committee resolution "making it broad enough so that an investigation can be made not only of those movements which are dedicated to the ultimate overthrow of government by force and violence, but as to any other activities, the objective of which is to form American public opinion on a political matter, or group action in arraying Americans against Americans, so as to ultimately affect the domestic and external policies of our country."

Mr. Robsion then gave the following explanation of the nature and scope of the resolution creating the committee and spelling out its powers:

The purpose of this resolution is for a committee of this House to make a thorough investigation not only of communism and nazism but of the Fascists and every other organization in this Nation that is putting out this un-American propaganda and engaging in un-American activities in the United States and diffusing within our country subversive un-American propaganda. Let us find out what un-American and subversive activities are being carried on and who it is that is instigating these activities and providing the money to carry them on.

Mr. Dunn, an opponent of the resolution, said:

Mr. Speaker, the resolution which is being considered before the House today is for the purpose of appointing a committee to investigate the un-American activities that are supposed to be going on throughout our country.

The final statement about the need for the House to adopt the resolution creating the committee was made by Mr. O'Connor of New York who, in speaking about communism, said:

We must investigate its strength, its sources, its activities, and its leaders, in high or low places.

In addition, the name given to the committee by the House refutes the claim that the committee is empowered to investigate only propaganda, ideas, opinions, and speech. In establishing the committee in 1938, the House designated it as the "Special Committee on Un-American Activities." In voting to make it a standing committee in 1945 the House retained its designation as the "Committee on Un-American Activities"—and this same designation was included in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—Public Law 601, 79th Congress. For 28 years now, the clear intent of the House, from whose authority the committee's power flows, has been that it investigate not only propaganda but

all kinds of activities embraced by its mandate.

The petition to abolish the committee completely overlooks the fact that, in addition to directing the Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate "the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities" and its "diffusion within the United States," House rule XI, paragraph 18, also directs the committee to investigate "all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation."

To cite just a few examples, "other questions in relation thereto" would include the ultimate purpose of the propaganda and propaganda activities being investigated; the power, agency, or organization—foreign or domestic—in whose interest the propaganda is being disseminated; the organization of groups to disseminate the propaganda in behalf of that power or agency; the financing of these groups; the recruiting techniques used by them; their organizational structure, membership, strength, and tactics; their use of fronts or other groups to raise funds for, and to disseminate, their propaganda; and all other activities in any way associated with the power, agency, or organization in question and its propaganda operations.

In addition, as I said before, the courts have consistently upheld the view that the committee's authority is not limited to investigation of propaganda. In the 1959 *Barenblatt* case, a contempt decision growing out of a hearing of this committee, the Supreme Court held that—

In pursuance of its legislative concerns in the domain of "national security" the House has clothed the Un-American Activities Committee with pervasive authority to investigate Communist activities in this country.

It can hardly be seriously argued that the investigation of Communist activities generally, and the attendant use of compulsory process, was beyond the purview of the committee's intended authority under rule XI. (*Barenblatt v. U.S.A.*, 360 U.S. 109.)

Finally, I would make this point: propaganda is obviously not self-generating. It must be planned, composed, printed, and disseminated. All these steps involve actions, rather than the mere association, ideas, opinions, and speech of individuals. They also necessitate concerted activity by individuals and groups. Thus, even if the House had not so explicitly spelled out the fact that the committee's authority was not limited to the investigation of certain types of propaganda activities, and the courts had not so held, it would still be clear from the full text of the committee resolution that its power extends beyond inquiry into ideas, opinions, speech, and other forms of expression.

ALLEGATION NO. 2

The committee's powers are undefined. No precise meaning has been given, or can be given, to such "vague" terms as "un-American" and "subversive."

REPLY

The Supreme Court itself, in the previously quoted *Barenblatt* decision, refuted this claim by holding that the

¹ Emphasis mine. In this and the following quotations, those words which clearly indicate congressional intent that the committee's power was to extend beyond inquiry into ideas, opinions, speech, and other forms of expression, have been italicized.

terms "un-American" and "subversive" unquestionably embrace Communist activities.

More important than this, however, is what the House of Representatives has itself designated as un-American and subversive—because it is the House that drafted and approved the committee's resolution and is the final authority on this question. This matter was thoroughly explored on the day the Special Committee on Un-American Activities was created. On that occasion, the following statements defining and clarifying what was meant by the words "un-American" and "subversive" were made, without contradiction, by various Members of the House:

Mr. TAYLOR. "This resolution is not confined to any particular type or denomination of *un-Americanism*.² It embraces all varieties—nazism, communism, and fascism—and none of these 'isms' have any place on American soil * * *.

"Mr. Speaker, a few years ago I had the privilege and honor to serve on a special committee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], which investigated un-American activities in this country * * *. As a result of our investigation and findings certain salutary legislation has resulted. We discovered in our probe that there are certain well-organized un-American movements operating in this country which were parented and financed by foreign governments, and which are inimical to the welfare of this Nation. We found an active communistic movement in our land, which recognized no other government than that enthroned in Moscow, and we found a very active Nazi movement which recognized no other authority save that of the German Fuehrer, Adolph Hitler. We also found a Fascist movement which was more or less passive and desultory, which had its foundation in Rome and paid tribute alone to Mussolini.

"Mr. Speaker, we have no place in our scheme of government for dual citizenship. We must be either American or alien. There can be no qualification or reservation when it comes to allegiance to our flag and to our country. No man can maintain allegiance to the United States and at the same time bear allegiance to some foreign king, potentate, or dictator no more than he can serve both God and mammon."

Mr. FORD had the following to say:

A great many have seemed to be in doubt as to what un-American means. I want to make just one statement in this connection. As it appears in this resolution, it seems to me to mean, among other things, nazism. That is un-American, and I deplore its existence in this country. The establishment of camps organized by a foreign power, and financed by a foreign power, which teach the young people of this country the philosophy of nazism, which is "actual" the philosophy that would deny the very thing that some of you men advocate in the way of freedom of speech and assembly.

I will not repeat them here, but a number of other statements made on the floor that day—May 26, 1938—which have been quoted in my reply to the first allegation also define and clarify what the House meant by the words "Un-American" and "subversive."

² In all quotations used in this section, the words "un-American" and "subversive," and all other words and phrases defining them, have been italicized.

Member after Member spoke so clearly on the subject that at one point in the debate the present Speaker of the House, Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, said:

Brushing aside everything, we know what un-American means in the sense of this resolution * * *. Everyone knows what un-American means in the sense that it is used in the pending resolution, and this committee, whoever is in charge, would have the responsibility of confining its investigation to facts that we feel are of a subversive nature.

On February 3, 1939, in the debate on the resolution authorizing the continuance of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities—which was passed by a vote of 344 to 35—Mr. Fish stated:

Mr. Speaker, this House proposes in a few minutes to adopt by an overwhelming vote the resolution before it and to serve notice upon all Communists, Nazis, and Fascists that the Members of the House will not compromise in any way with the spread of communism, nazism, or fascism in the United States. [Applause.]

Following the vote of the House on the continuation of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, the House considered its appropriation on February 9, 1939. In the course of this appropriation debate, Mr. Sabath said:

I hope that the Dies committee, with the renewed life and additional funds granted it, will go out and do a real job in exposing un-American activities. And by un-American activities, I mean the acts of the Nazis, the Fascists, the Silver Shirts, and all the other subversive groups, and not only the Communists. I despise them all with equal intensity.

The following year, in the course of the debate which took place January 23, 1940, on the continuation of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Robsion addressed the House as follows:

Many persons desire to know what is meant by *un-American activities*. The committee itself lays down what I consider a very clear statement of *un-American activities* on page 2 of its report:

"By un-American activities we mean organizations and groups existing in the United States which are directed, controlled, and subsidized by foreign agencies or governments, and which seek to change the form of government of the United States in accordance with the wishes of such foreign governments."

"The Dies committee finds that these un-American activities flow from three general groups—Communists, Nazis, and Fascists. Each of these groups was born in a foreign land. Each is directed, controlled, and subsidized by foreign governments and agencies. Each of these groups seek to change our politics and form of government in accordance with the wishes and purposes of foreign governments. The leaders of each of these groups swear allegiance to foreign governments. Their purpose is to overthrow our Government by force and violence, if necessary, and substitute for our policies and form of government the policies and forms of government of foreign nations."

Mr. Voorhis responded to Mr. Robsion with the following:

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Robsion] quoted from the report a definition of un-American activities which, in my opinion, sets forth the scope of this committee and is the proper field of work.

More recently, on March 23, 1950, in the course of debate on the committee's

appropriation for that year, Mr. Dolinger said:

Mr. Speaker, the House Un-American Activities Committee was created to do the things its very name implies; to wit, to investigate and eliminate everything *un-American which seeks to overthrow or undermine our American form of government*. In my opinion, that would mean the investigation of Nazis, Fascists, KKK's, Communists, as well as other subversive groups.

Throughout the 28 years of the committee's existence there has been no disagreement in the House as to the meaning of the terms "un-American" and "subversive." Over and over again, numerous Members have said in discussion of the committee's resolution and appropriations that these terms generally include communism, nazism, fascism and any other activities designed to influence, undermine, or change our form of government in the interest of a foreign power, or by force or violence or any other unconstitutional means.

It is important to note that even prior to the creation of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1938 the terms "un-American" and "subversive" were used in the House to designate Communist, Nazi, and Fascist activities.

On March 20, 1934, in the debate on the resolution authorizing an appropriation for the Special Committee on Un-American Activities chaired by the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK—sometimes referred to as the "Special Committee To Investigate Nazi and Other Subversive Activities"—Mr. Dickstein, the author of the resolution who was to serve as vice chairman of that committee, made the following statement:

This special investigating committee should seek to accomplish three primary objects: First, ascertain the facts about methods of introduction into this country of destructive, *subversive propaganda* originating from foreign countries; second, ascertain facts about organizations in this country that seem to be cooperating to spread this alien propaganda through their membership in this country; third, to study and recommend to the House appropriate legislation which may correct existing facts and tend to prevent the recurrence of a similar condition in the future.

In further debate on the resolution creating the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, which took place on June 11, 1934, the present Speaker of the House said:

We want to investigate communistic activities, as to the source; not to listen to mere speeches or opinions, but to try to find out the source of the money, where the money comes from, the source of these activities in this country, if possible. We will also investigate other *subversive organizations*.

Already as the result of investigations the head of the Silver Shirts was indicted in North Carolina for violation of the State laws, and the evidence clearly discloses that the same man should be indicted for violation of Federal laws.

On that same day, Mr. Weideman said:

Now, as to the work the committee is doing, I want to say that the chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is doing a fine piece of work. We

are proposing to do what the mandate of Congress told us to do; that is, to investigate any and all subversive and un-American activities and to report back to Congress.

Mr. Dickstein also stated:

But, gentlemen, since this investigation was started, we have been reliably informed that there was a certain movement in this country where money was being brought in to support communism, and we were also advised since the adoption of the resolution authorizing the investigation that there is another well-organized body that is spreading propaganda, originating from another country, which also is subversive to our form of government. In other words, since the adoption of that resolution the committee has positively received and heard sworn testimony that there are other groups in this country that require checking in order that the full purposes of House Resolution 198 may be accomplished.

I cannot conceive of any reason why any Member of this House, elected to represent a portion of the American people in this Congress should represent his own constituents as objecting to a committee of this House trying to find facts relating to sources of direction, financial support, and dissemination here of destructive and subversive propaganda that seems to attack the principles of government upon which this United States was founded and has prospered for over 150 years.

Thus, over 30 years ago, the terms "un-American" and "subversive" were used in the House to designate precisely both Communists and Nazis.

Over 20 years ago, this committee requested the Brookings Institution, one of the most respected institutes in this country engaged in research and training in the social sciences, to prepare a study of what constituted an "un-American" activity. This study was completed in 1945. Based on its analysis of the resolution creating the Committee on un-American Activities, the U.S. Constitution and the oath prescribed by Congress for all foreign-born persons seeking U.S. citizenship, the Brookings Institution arrived at the following "substantive standards" of what constitutes an un-American activity and could, therefore, be investigated by the committee:

First. It is un-American for any individual or group by force, intimidation, deceit, fraud, or bribery, to prevent or seek to prevent any person from exercising any right or privilege which cannot constitutionally be denied to him either by the Federal Government or by a State government.

Second. It is un-American for any individual to advocate, to conspire, or to attempt to bring about a change in the form of government in the United States without following the processes prescribed for that purpose by the Constitution of the United States and by the constitutions of the several States.

Third. It is un-American for any person secretly to conspire by any method, constitutional or otherwise, to overthrow or attempt to overthrow a government of law and to substitute therefor a government vested with complete discretionary power.

Fourth. It is un-American for any person with the primary intent to advance the interests of a foreign nation or association to take action clearly and

definitely against the interests of the United States, provided the interests of the United States have been properly formulated and declared by a duly authorized governmental agency proceeding in accordance with law. Receipt of compensation from any foreign nation or association or representatives thereof would create a presumption of primary intent.

Fifth. In time of war or threatened war, it is un-American for any person with the intent to interfere with the successful preparation for or prosecution of war or with the intent to give assistance to the enemy or to a nonbelligerent neutral allied with or promoting the interests of that enemy or prospective enemy, publicly to advocate, or to conspire to promote the advocacy of, any doctrine that hampers the execution of policies already adopted by the Nation through due process of law to carry on or prepare for war.

The U.S. Court of Appeals in New York apparently has had no difficulty in finding a precise meaning for the terms "un-American" and "subversive." Almost 20 years ago, in the case of *U.S. v. Josephson*, a 1947 decision on a contempt of Congress case which grew out of a hearing of this committee, the court held:

The subject of *un-American* and *subversive* activities is within the investigating power of Congress. (165 F.2d 82)

In summary, the courts have not found the terms "un-American" and "subversive" so vague as to have no precise meaning. The Brookings Institution, by scholarly analysis, found precise meaning for the term "un-American" over 20 years ago. The American people, for 30 or more years now, have indicated that they clearly understand what is meant by the words "un-American" and "subversive" in the committee's resolution. And, almost 30 years ago, the present Speaker of the House, speaking for that body, stated, "Everyone knows what un-American means in the sense that it is used in the pending resolution."

One wonders what is wrong with the alleged constitutional and legal authorities who claim that these terms have not been, and cannot be, defined.

ALLEGATION NO. 3

Because the committee's powers are "directed exclusively" against the rights of free and open expression or association for such purposes, the committee's existence cannot be justified under any concept of democracy.

REPLY

The answers to the two previous allegations refute this claim because they prove conclusively that the committee's powers are directed against subversive activities rather than the rights of free and open expression or association for such purposes.

Communists, Fascists, Nazis, and all others who secretly plot the overthrow of this Government by force and violence, whether or not they do it in behalf of a foreign power, are not merely exercising first amendment guaranteed rights of free and open expression and association. They are engaging in ac-

tivities which most definitely are not protected by the Constitution.

The courts have consistently held that all conspiracies—even though they involve elements of speech, expression, and association—are not within first amendment protections.

In his concurring opinion in the case of *Dennis* against the United States, the 1951 Supreme Court decision, upholding the constitutionality of the Smith Act (which makes it a crime to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the Government), Justice Robert H. Jackson stated bluntly:

The Constitution does not make conspiracy a civil right. (341 U.S. 494, 572.)

Again, in his concurring opinion in the case of *A.C.A. against Douds*, a 1950 Supreme Court decision which also involved Communist activities, Justice Jackson reminded that—

The conspiracy principle has traditionally been employed to protect society against all 'ganging up' or concerted action in violation of its laws.

He also pointed out that—

No term passes that this Court does not sustain convictions based on that doctrine for violations of the antitrust laws or other statutes. (339 U.S. 382, 432.)

As is well known, the committee's investigations during recent years have been concentrated on the activities of the Communist Party, an organization which makes extensive use of speech and other forms of expression to conceal its secret, conspiratorial nature and purposes, its ties with a foreign power, and also to accomplish its aims. The Supreme Court has held that the first amendment guarantees of free speech and association do not bar congressional disclosure of such activity.

Justice Frankfurter, speaking for the majority of the Court in its June 5, 1961, decision upholding the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act, went directly to the issues of conspiracy, foreign domination, disclosure of such, and first amendment guarantees of free speech and association. He said:

Where the mask of anonymity which an organization's members wear serves the double purpose of protecting them from popular prejudice and of enabling them to cover over a foreign-directed conspiracy, infiltrate into other groups, and enlist the support of persons who would not, if the truth were revealed, lend their support, it would be a distortion of the first amendment to hold that it prohibits Congress from removing the mask. (367 U.S. 1.)

On this key issue, the dissenting minority of the Court, with one exception, agreed with the majority. Justice Douglas writing for the minority (excepting Justice Black), pointed out that when a group which uses speech, expression, and association also engages in certain other kinds of activities, its operations are no longer protected by the first amendment:

The Bill of Rights was designed to give fullest play to the exchange and dissemination of ideas that touch the politics, culture, and other aspects of our life. When an organization is used by a foreign power to make advances here, questions of security are raised beyond the ken of disputation and debate between the people resident here. Es-

pionage, business activities, formation of cells for subversion, as well as the exercise of first amendment rights, are then used to pry open our society and make intrusion of a foreign power easy. These machinations of a foreign power add additional elements to free speech just as marching up and down adds something to picketing that goes beyond free speech.

In 1954, the Subcommittee on Rules of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration held extensive hearings on a series of resolutions relating to rules of procedure for Senate investigating committees. In its report it considered, among other things, the question of congressional inquiry into what are claimed to be personal beliefs and associations and the criticism that congressional committees had made improper inquiries into these matters. The committee drew the following conclusion:

Committees of Congress must function in a world of realities. What might have been classified decades ago as private opinion of no concern to Congress, takes on a different connotation in the light of world events whose impact Congress may not disregard. The global Communist apparatus is neither a study group nor a debating society. It is an engine of destruction. Cunningly fashioned, its component parts are artfully disguised when disguise carries advantage. It is no answer to its challenge to say that the beliefs and associations of its members or suspected members are "private," and thus beyond the scope of legitimate inquiry by Congress.

We believe that Congress * * * has a legitimate function to perform in this field—that of informing itself and the public of the nature and extent of Communist penetration into our free institutions. ("Rules of Procedure for Senate Investigating Committees," Report of the Committee on Rules and Administration, 84th Cong., 1st sess., Senate Rept. No. 2, pp. 9, 10.)

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has held not only that Congress has a right to make investigations such as those conducted by this committee, but that it has an obligation to do so whenever it is cognizant of the fact that there is in existence a movement which poses a threat to itself and the Government of the United States. In its 1948 decision in the case of Barsky against the United States, another contempt case growing out of an investigation by this committee, the court held:

The prime functions of governments, in the American concept, is to preserve and protect the rights of the people. The Congress is part of the Government thus established for this purpose.

This existing machinery of Government has power to inquire into potential threats to itself, not alone for the selfish reason of self-protection, but for the basic reason that having been established by the people as an instrumentality for the protection of the rights of people, it has an obligation to its creators to preserve itself. * * * We think that inquiry into threats to the existing form of Government by extra-constitutional process of change is a power of Congress under its prime obligation to protect for the people that machinery of which it is a part.

If Congress has power to inquire into the subjects of communism and the Communist Party, it has power to identify the individuals who believe in communism and those who belong to the party.

It would be sheer folly as a matter of governmental policy to refrain from inquiry into potential threats to its existence or security

until danger was clear and present. * * * How, except upon inquiry, would the Congress know whether the danger is clear and present? There is a vast difference between the necessities for inquiry and the necessities for action. (167 F. 2d 241, 246.)

Barsky sought review of this decision in the Supreme Court. The Court denied certiorari, thereby leaving undisturbed the above-quoted holding of the court of appeals. (334 U.S. 843.)

ALLEGATION NO. 4

The committee has done much harm because it has taken as its main function the exposure and extermination of ideas, opinions, and groups it thinks are "un-American."

REPLY

The Supreme Court denies this. In the *Barenblatt* case, the Court found:

From the beginning, without interruption to the present time, and with the undoubted knowledge and approval of the House, the committee has devoted a major part of its energies to the investigation of Communist activities. (345 U.S. 930.)

Are the signers of the petition now trying to claim—in the face of numerous contrary findings by the Congress, the courts, the Executive and the overwhelming majority of Americans—that communism is "American" and that it is only the Committee on Un-American Activities which conceives it to be "un-American"?

What other groups and activities has the Committee on Un-American Activities investigated?

As a special committee, it investigated Nazis and Fascists when they, like the Communists, were active in this country on a significant scale and a threat to the national welfare and security.

Do the petition signers claim that nazism and fascism are "American"?

The truth is that the committee has taken as its main function the investigation, disclosure, and revelation (or "exposure," to quote the petition), and the recommending of legislation to compel revelation of and to curb and hinder, the activities of the very groups which the House of Representatives found to be subversive and un-American when it drafted the committee's mandate in 1938.

The committee recently held extensive hearings on Ku Klux Klan groups. As a special committee, it had subpoenaed some Klan leaders to testify in the early 1940's when it found links between the Klans and the Nazis. It undertook its recent major investigation of the Klans after the chairman had explained on the floor of the House why the committee considered that the activities of these groups came within its jurisdiction and the House, by an overwhelming vote, had indicated its agreement.

Are the petition signers now trying to tell the American people that the House of Representatives was wrong, and that the activities of various Klan groups, as revealed in the committee's hearings, are completely American?

In regard to the allegation concerning "extermination," let me say this: The committee fully realizes that you cannot exterminate any idea or opinion by investigation or legislation, and it has no intention of trying to achieve the impos-

sible in regard to those which are subversive and un-American.

As far as the "extermination" of organizations is concerned: The House of Representatives, in creating the committee, expressed recognition of the fact that disclosure and revelation, through investigative hearings, of the activities of groups that are un-American and subversive, is not only a necessary step in providing a basis for remedial legislation, but is also one of the most effective methods of hindering and impeding their operations. The committee's record of investigations and legislative recommendations demonstrates that, in this respect it has done exactly what the House has wanted it to do.

Naturally, the committee would like to see the end of all Communist, Nazi, Fascist, and Klan activities in this country. It realizes, however, that legislation and investigation alone will not bring this about. Despite this, it is confident that continued and proper use of these constitutional weapons, combined with an informed public, will not only prevent all groups of these types from achieving their ultimate goal but will also insure that they will never win a significant following among the American people.

And what about the charge of "exposure"?

In democratic societies, legislatures have an informing or educational function which is an integral part of, and basic to, their lawmaking function. Woodrow Wilson, a recognized authority on political science and constitutional law, who taught at Princeton University before his election to the Presidency of the United States, believed that the informing function of Congress was even more important than its lawmaking function. In his book, "Congressional Government," he wrote:

Even more important than legislation is the instruction and guidance in political affairs which the people might receive from a body which kept all national concerns suffused in a broad daylight of discussion * * *. The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function.

All congressional committees, through their hearings and reports, perform an informing function, educating the American people about the major problems confronting the Nation and the means, legislative or otherwise, which might be used to solve them.

The important role this function plays in strengthening and preserving a democratic society is not open to question.

Curiously, however, when this committee carries out its informing function, certain people immediately accuse it of "exposure." But this is no more than a smear word for a legitimate and necessary congressional duty. "Exposure" is disclosure, revelation, informing the people about what they must know to govern themselves intelligently and preserve the Government which they have created for their own protection.

Supreme Court and court of appeals decisions upholding the rights of Congress to compel disclosure of Communist organizations and the activities and identities of individual Communists both

by legislation and investigation were quoted in my reply to the last allegation—No. 3.

Last year the Supreme Court pinpointed the value of disclosure or "exposure" hearings by all governmental agencies in a decision upholding the right of the Federal Communications Commission to hold a public rather than closed hearing on a matter of public interest. The Court noted:

The Commission observed that, in addition to stimulating the flow of information, public hearings serve to inform those segments of the public primarily affected by the agency's regulatory policies and those likely to be affected by subsequent administrative or legislative action of the factual basis for any action ultimately taken—a practical inducement to public acceptance of the results of the investigation. Also implicit in the Commission's discourse is a recognition that publicity tends to stimulate the flow of information and public preferences which may significantly influence administrative and legislative views as to the necessity and character of prospective action. The Commission further pointed out that public disclosure is necessary to the execution of its duty under section 4(k) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 48 Stat. 1068, 47 U.S.C. section 154(k) (1958 ed.), to make annual reports to Congress. Significantly, this investigation was specifically authorized by Congress so that Congress might "draw upon the facts which are obtained." (*FCC v. Schreiber*, 381 U.S. 279.)

A very telling statement on the role informing, revelation, and disclosure or "exposure" play in handling problems in a democratic society was made by President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights:

The principle of disclosure is, we believe, the appropriate way to deal with those who would subvert our democracy by revolution or by encouraging disunity and destroying the civil rights of some groups.

Congress has already made use of the principle of disclosure in both the economic and political spheres. The Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission and the Pure Food and Drug Administration make available to the public information about sponsors of economic wares. In the political realm, the Federal Communications Commission, the Post Office Department, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the Secretary of the Senate—all of these under various statutes—are required to collect information about those who attempt to influence public opinion. Thousands of statements disclosing ownership and control of newspapers using the second-class mailing privilege are filed annually with the Post Office Department. Hundreds of statements disclosing the ownership and control of radio stations are filed with the Federal Communications Commission. Hundreds of lobbyists are now required to disclose their efforts to influence Congress under the Congressional Reorganization Act. In 1938, Congress found it necessary to pass the Foreign Agents Registration Act which forced certain citizens and aliens alike to register with the Department of Justice the facts about their sponsorship and activities. The effectiveness of these efforts has varied. We believe, however, that they have been sufficiently successful to warrant their further extension to all of those who attempt to influence public opinion.

The ultimate responsibility for countering totalitarianism of all kinds rests, as always, with the mass of good, democratic Americans, their organizations and their leaders. The Federal Government ought to provide a

source of reference * * * where private citizens and groups may find accurate information about the activities, sponsorship and background of those who are active in the marketplace of public opinion. (Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, 1947, pp. 52, 53.)

Laws are essential to any well-ordered society. But in a democratic society, laws are not enough. Alone, they rarely eliminate any problem. An informed public is needed to supplement, by public discussion, debate, and action, the sanctions imposed by law on the enemies of society.

For those Americans—and they number in the millions—who want "accurate information about the activities, sponsorship, and background" of the subverters of freedom and democracy who are "active in the marketplace of public opinion," the House Committee on Un-American Activities has provided a reliable "source of reference" for 28 years.

In doing so, it has helped preserve the democratic process and prevent its corruption and debasement by those who, with totalitarian ends in mind, give only lip service to the principles of democratic society.

ALLEGATION NO. 5

The committee has done much harm because its methods have often been unfair.

REPLY

No specifics are given to substantiate the claim that the committee's methods are often "unfair." For this reason, I can do no more than make a general statement on this subject.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has actually been a pacesetter in establishing fair rules of congressional procedure and in observing them. It was the first committee of the House to publish its rules of procedure in booklet form. This was done in 1953, after the committee had been following these rules for some years.

Several times since 1953, the committee has appointed subcommittees to consider amendments to its rules. In 1955 and in 1961, the chairman of this subcommittee, the late Honorable Clyde Doyle of California, invited all Members of the House to submit any recommendations or proposals they had for improving the committee's rules. The extremely small number of suggestions received in response to these invitations has been a tribute to the thoroughness and fairness with which the committee, over the years, has developed rules of procedure fully consonant with constitutional and other rights.

In 1955, the House adopted House Resolution 151, which was authored by Mr. Doyle and which, he stated on the floor, was based largely on the experiences of the Committee on Un-American Activities. When adopted by the House, that resolution established fair rules of procedure for all its committees, with special reference to those with an investigative function.

All witnesses subpoenaed to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities are provided with a copy of the committee rules, so that they and their attorneys will have full opportunity to

insist upon the observance of the procedures and the rights of witnesses spelled out in them.

The courts of this country, in numerous contempt cases, have had an opportunity to review the committee's rules of procedure. In no instance have they found them unconstitutional or violative of witnesses' rights.

Moreover, contrary to the above allegation, the Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives of the American Bar Association, after its members had made a study of the committee's hearings, reached the following conclusion:

The congressional committees investigating communism, and in particular the House Un-American Activities Committee, have been attacked on the ground that they have engaged in smear campaigns and have invaded the constitutional rights of persons investigated. Your committee is impressed with the fairness with which hearings before that committee have been conducted during the period of time indicated by our study of the published testimony. We are satisfied that the witnesses called to testify before the committee are being treated fairly and properly in all respects and we also feel satisfied that each witness is accorded full protection as far as his constitutional or other legal rights are involved; moreover, the confidential communications between attorneys and clients have been fully respected.

It is the view of your committee that current attacks on the House Un-American Activities Committee are unjustified. Whether deliberate or misguided, such unwarranted attacks result in reducing the effectiveness of that committee's great service to the American people.

ALLEGATION NO. 6

The committee has done much harm because it has attempted to create permanent machinery designed to censor the opinions and associations of American citizens.

REPLY

On May 22, 1930, the House determined that a special committee should be created to investigate Communist activities and propaganda in the United States.

Four years later, on March 20, 1934, it again determined that a special committee should be established to investigate Nazi and Communist—subversive—propaganda activities in the United States.

On May 26, 1938, it determined once more that a special committee was needed to investigate the varied subversive and un-American activities that were going on in this country. It set up such a committee. In each subsequent Congress—until 1945—it determined that conditions were such that this special committee should be reconstituted.

In 1945, in the light of both national and international developments, the House determined that the Special Committee on Un-American Activities should be made a permanent, or standing, committee. The following year, it reiterated this determination in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.). The adoption of this statute, which brought about the most extensive reform of the Congress to take place in this century, was preceded by extensive hearings in which Members of

the House and Senate and constitutional authorities testified. By this act, the number of standing committees in the House was cut from 48 to 19. Although 29 other standing committees were eliminated by this statute, the Committee on Un-American Activities—which had then been a standing committee for only 1 year—was retained as such by the House.

During the 21 years that have passed since that time, a few Members of the House have called for the abolition of the committee. Every such proposal, however, has been overwhelmingly rejected by the House.

Thus, it has not been the committee but the House itself—435 elected Representatives of the American people—who have determined that the Committee on Un-American Activities should be a permanent institution.

And what about the claim that the purpose of the committee is to censor the opinions and associations of American citizens? It has already been demonstrated that it is the intention and finding of the House, and also the finding of the courts, that the committee is designed to—and actually has—investigated the activities of groups and individuals which are considered by the House, by the American people and the courts, to be subversive and un-American.

Over and over again, when witnesses subpoenaed to testify before the committee have started to expound their ideas and opinions, they have been informed that the committee is not interested in these, but wants answers to questions asked about their actions. It is then that the witnesses invoke the fifth amendment. It is their actions, not their ideas, that they are queried about and do not want to talk about.

On the question of associations, the fact is that the committee is not interested in anyone's purely casual or social "associations." It is, however, interested in "associations" which indicate conspiratorial or other activity in furtherance of subversive and un-American purposes. This House and committee interest is fully supported by the courts.

In his previously referred to concurring opinion in the case of *American Communications Association against Douds*, Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson pointed out:

There has recently entered the dialectic of politics a cliché used to condemn application of the conspiracy principle to Communists. "Guilt by association" is an epithet frequently used and little explained, except that it is generally accompanied by another slogan, "guilt is personal." Of course it is; but personal guilt may be incurred by joining a conspiracy. That act of association makes one responsible for the acts of others committed in pursuance of the association. It is wholly a question of the sufficiency of evidence of association to imply conspiracy.

In the case of *Adler v. Board of Education* (342 U.S. 485), the decision upholding the constitutionality of New York State's Feinberg law (which bars Communists and persons affiliated with subversive organizations from employ-

ment in the New York State school system), the Supreme Court ruled:

One's associates, past and present, as well as one's conduct, may properly be considered in determining fitness and loyalty. From time immemorial, one's reputation has been determined in part by the company he keeps . . . we know of no rule, constitutional or otherwise, that prevents the State, when determining the fitness and loyalty of such persons, from considering the organizations and persons with whom they associate.

Other courts have made equally telling statements concerning the propriety of the committee's investigating an individual's actions and associations, as measured against the first amendment private rights of freedom of belief, opinion, and association.

The court of appeals in New York held, in the case of *U.S. against Josephson*, still another contempt proceeding arising from a hearing of this committee, that—

The investigations authorized by statute and resolution creating the Committee on Un-American Activities concern the welfare and safety of the Government and Nation and not the mere private affairs of private citizens. (165 F. 2d, 82.)

In the previously mentioned case of *Barsky against U.S.*, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia held that—

We hold that in view of the representations to the Congress as to the nature, purposes and program of communism and the Communist Party, and in view of the legislation proposed, pending and possible in respect to or premised upon that subject, and in view of the involvement of that subject in the foreign policy of the Government, Congress has power to make an inquiry of an individual which may elicit the answer that the witness is a believer in communism or a member of the Communist Party. And we further hold that the provision we have quoted from House Resolution 5 is sufficiently clear, definite and authoritative to permit this particular committee to make that particular inquiry. (*Barsky v. U.S.*, 167 F. 2d 241.)

Again, in its June 5, 1961, decision upholding the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act, the Supreme Court stated:

The Communist Party would have us hold that the first amendment prohibits Congress from requiring . . . [disclosure statements] . . . by organizations substantially dominated or controlled by the foreign powers controlling the world Communist movement and which operate primarily to advance the objectives of that movement: the overthrow of existing government by any means necessary and the establishment in its place of a Communist totalitarian dictatorship. . . . We cannot find such a prohibition in the first amendment. So to find would make a travesty of that amendment and the great ends for the well-being of our democracy that it serves. (*Communist Party v. SACB*, 367 U.S. 1.)

ALLEGATION NO. 7

The committee has done much harm because as a result of above allegations 4, 5, and 6 it has curtailed the discussion of controversial issues and hindered the development of new ideas and approaches to troublesome problems.

REPLY

It is obvious that debate and discussion, formal and informal, on all kinds of political and other controversial issues is

proceeding today at a much greater rate than it was 28 years ago when the committee was created. This is due primarily to more widespread education, greater news coverage of local, national, and international affairs, the further development of radio and television, and various other factors which have generally promoted the dissemination of information.

All committees of Congress, however, through their hearings and reports, promote discussion of controversial issues within their jurisdiction and also the development of new ideas and approaches to problems in that area.

As regards the subject of communism, security, and subversive and un-American activities generally, the Committee on Un-American Activities has done much to promote discussion of controversial issues and the development of new ideas in meeting problems associated with these subjects.

In the 28 years of existence, it has heard approximately 4,000 witnesses. While a great majority of these have been Communists and other have been Nazis, Fascists, and Klanners, many have been recognized authorities on various matters within the committee's jurisdiction. They have included representatives of the Department of Justice, FBI, the Departments of Defense, State, and other executive branch agencies; trade union leaders, clergymen, educators, newspapermen, and authors. They have represented every shade of political opinion.

The millions of copies of committee publications containing the testimony and views of all these witnesses which have been distributed throughout this country, combined with news coverage of the committee's hearings and reports, have provided a wealth of information for private and public discussion and debate, classroom instruction, speeches by many persons in all walks of life, and also the writing of numerous scholarly works on all aspects of the Communist problem. Many books on the subjects of communism, subversion and security, written by nationally and internationally known authors and authorities, have quoted from, summarized and referred to information developed by the committee, both in the informative phase of their treatment of their subject matter, and also in making suggestions and drawing conclusions as to what steps can be taken to solve the problems posed by Communist activity.

It is rather difficult to understand how certain advocates of "unpopular" views can loudly proclaim their views, over and over again, on radio and television programs and in other public appearances and also proclaim at the same time, that a blanket of "fear" and "silence" has spread over this country, so that no one holding unorthodox and dissenting viewpoints dares express them.

It is also difficult to understand—at least for me—how these same persons can credit (or blame) one nine-man congressional committee with wielding such tremendous power over a nation of 190 million people.

ALLEGATION NO. 8

The committee serves no useful purpose because it considers only a handful

of bills each year, all of which are in the jurisdiction of other committees.

REPLY

House rule XI assigns to the 20 standing committees of the House their respective duties. As regards most other committees, it directs only that they consider all legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and so forth—which being in their jurisdiction—are referred to them. It gives the Committee on Un-American Activities, however, completely different duties. It directs it to make investigations of certain activities "that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation" and to report its findings to the House, "together with such recommendations as it deems advisable." While all standing committees of the House have legislative functions, in other words, the Committee on Un-American Activities has been assigned a primarily—though not exclusively—investigative duty.

In compliance with rule XI, the Committee on Un-American Activities, in its 28 years of existence, has made hundreds of investigations. The results of most of these have been revealed in public hearings. It has heard about 4,000 witnesses and published over 500 separate volumes containing the transcripts of both public and executive testimony and the results of its research studies and investigations.

Based on its investigations, hearings, and research, it has made over 160 legislative recommendations to the House. Independent studies made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in 1958 and 1960, combined with the congressional legislation record for the last 5 years, reveal that approximately 45 laws enacted by the Congress have implemented recommendations made by this committee.

Among them are the following laws which have been enacted as a result of bills reported by the Committee on Un-American Activities:

Public Law 81-831, Internal Security Act of 1950.

Public Law 83-557, amending section 7(d) of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Public Law 83-637, Communist Control Act of 1954.

Public Law 87-474, amending section 3, paragraph (7), and section 5, subsection (b) of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Public Law 88-290, amending the Internal Security Act of 1950 by adding thereto a new title III, relating to personnel security procedures in National Security Agency.

The committee's investigations and research have, in some instances, convinced it that certain problems involving Communist activities could best be met by executive action, rather than by legislation. In these instances, it has recommended appropriate action to the executive. The record reveals that in more than a dozen such instances, the committee's policy recommendations have been adopted by the executive branch.

With all due respect for other governmental agencies which have been assigned duties in the general area of subversion and security and which have

done excellent jobs in their respective areas, I can say that the Committee on Un-American Activities, in compliance with rule XI, has given the Congress—and thus the American people—more information on Communist, Nazi, Fascist, and other subversive activities than any other agency of Government. In doing so, it has figured decisively in preserving the security of the United States.

Moreover, the information it has developed has been of such accuracy and quality that its publications are used not only by Congress in performance of its legislative function and by executive branch agencies in their security operations, but also by scholars in preparing courses and writing books on communism, security, and related matters. In addition, they have been used as texts by schools and colleges and have been purchased by foreign governments as aids in the training of their foreign service and security personnel. In addition to the more than 8 million copies of the committee's hearings and reports which have been distributed to Congress, executive branch agencies and the American public, hundreds of thousands of its releases have been purchased from the Government Printing Office by private citizens and organizations and by agencies on all levels of government.

In view of the special investigative and informing function assigned to the committee by House rule XI and this record of accomplishment, I am not the least bit disturbed by any attack on the committee which is based on the fact that relatively few bills are referred to it each year. The simple fact of the matter is that the committee's primary function is to investigate and make recommendations which will assist the House in the performance of its legislative functions, rather than to merely consider legislation.

The implication, contained in this allegation, that all bills referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities are not within its jurisdiction, is patently false. Worse, it is an attack on the Speaker of the House and on all who have served as Speakers since the Committee on Un-American Activities has been a standing committee with legislative authority.

The Speaker has constitutional authority to refer legislation. The Manual of the House, as all of us know, points out that rule XI is mandatory on the Speaker in referring public bills.

That all recent Speakers have exercised their authority properly in referring bills to the Committee on Un-American Activities is attested by the fact that, to my knowledge, there has never been a case in which another committee has objected that a bill was incorrectly referred to this committee and the House has had to settle the issue by motion, as provided in the rules.

The fact that the Manual of the House grants that a bill "may contain matters properly within the jurisdiction of several committees" emphasizes the care the Speakers have exercised in referring legislation.

The above allegation could be true only if one accepts a thesis which neither I,

nor any other Member of the House, would accept—the thesis that the Speaker completely ignores the provisions of rule XI, and that he does so with the consent of the House as a whole.

ALLEGATION NO. 9

The committee serves no useful purpose because we have adequate security laws, regulations, procedures, and personnel.

REPLY

The above claim is refuted by the fact that, in each Congress, this and other committees recommend, and many Members of both the House and Senate introduce, bills related to internal security. Some of these bills are based on the independent study and belief of those who introduce them; some on the reports of congressional committees, including this committee; some on the statements and requests of officials of the executive branch of the Government.

Generally speaking, no country ever reaches the stage where it has all the laws and regulations needed in any area. New developments create new needs and render old laws inadequate. In each Congress new legislation is considered on matters affecting national defense, agriculture, labor, banking and currency, foreign affairs, and numerous other subjects.

There is certainly no reason to believe that the area of subversion and security is somehow different from all these others, that the United States has reached a stage of legislative perfection in this field that it has never been able to attain in others, and that there is not, and never will be, need for new legislation on the problem.

The argument about adequate personnel, I presume, is based on the existence of thousands of FBI agents and other security personnel in executive branch agencies. The Committee on Un-American Activities, however, has a completely different function than the FBI, the Armed Forces intelligence and counter-intelligence units and security personnel in other executive agencies. Their operations have nothing to do with legislation. They are concerned with countering enemy efforts to penetrate our Government, with developing evidence of violations of security laws and related matters.

This committee, on the other hand, has the job of developing information which will assist the Congress in its legislative function. Congress cannot fulfill its constitutional duties in the area of internal security and subversive activities unless it has a committee to serve it in this manner.

The difference in the functions of a legislative committee and security agencies, as such, was very clearly spelled out in a letter which FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover wrote to the late Clyde Doyle, a member of this committee, in response to an inquiry from Mr. Doyle asking his opinion of the work and value of congressional investigative committees. Mr. Hoover wrote, in part:

The American people owe a great debt of gratitude to the work over the years of congressional investigating committees. These committees, day after day, secure informa-

tion vitally needed in the consideration of new legislation. They are indeed indispensable parts of the American legislative process.

We in the FBI have the highest appreciation for the contributions rendered by congressional investigating committees dealing with un-American activities. Each in its own way is serving the American people. The FBI is strictly a fact-gathering agency. It does not express opinions or make recommendations on the information it secures. That is the function of other officials of the Government. As the investigative arm of the Department of Justice, the FBI is charged with the duty of investigating violations of the laws of the United States, collecting evidence in cases in which the United States is or may be a party in interest, and performing other duties imposed by law. Its function is not exposure or securing information for legislative purposes. That is the function of the congressional investigating committees.

I feel that both the FBI and congressional investigating committees, in the field of internal security, have important roles to play. We are working for the same goal—protecting our great Nation from enemies who seek to destroy us. Our work is not contradictory, but mutually helpful. That is as it should be.

Current developments on both the domestic and international fronts make it abundantly clear that questions of internal security and subversive activity are matters that demand special and continuing consideration by the Congress if the freedoms of the American people are to be preserved.

On July 1, 1960, the Special Committee on Communist Strategy, Tactics, and Objectives of the American Bar Association made the following statement:

The record of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security is one of accomplishments and achievements, despite the fact they have been the targets of inspired propaganda attacks designed to curb their effectiveness. Continuation of these committees is essential to the enactment of sound security legislation.

ALLEGATION NO. 10

Maintenance of a committee to restrict full and free discussion and unorthodox ideas betrays a lack of faith in a democratic society.

REPLY

First, it has already been demonstrated that the committee engages in two major types of activity: (1) the revelation, or disclosure, through investigation and public hearings, of certain activities designed to undermine and destroy our democratic society which are generally concealed from the public and the Congress; and (2) the recommending of remedial legislation to regulate, curb, and control such activities.

Certainly neither of these betrays a lack of faith in the democratic process. On the contrary, they indicate faith in and an effort to preserve the integrity of "full and free discussion" and honestly unorthodox ideas which are essential to progress.

The U.S. Constitution is the very embodiment of the principles and methods of democratic society. And the Constitution fully supports both the legislative and the investigative or disclosure activities of the committee.

The constitutionality and value of the committee's investigative and disclosure

activities have been thoroughly documented in 4(a).

The legislative aspect of the committee's activities, of course, cannot be questioned, and its constitutionality has been amply demonstrated in the many court decisions previously quoted. There is no need to belabor the point. I would point out, however, that all courts have consistently upheld investigative power, such as that conferred on the Committee on Un-American Activities, as a vital and necessary adjunct to the legislative process in a democratic society. In the case of *McGrain* against *Daugherty*—1927—the Supreme Court pointed out:

The power of inquiry—with process to enforce it—is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function. It was so regarded and employed in American legislatures before the Constitution was framed and ratified. (273 U.S. 135.)

Much more recently, in the previously mentioned *Barenblatt* case, the Court held:

That Congress has wide power to legislate in the field of Communist activity in this country, and to conduct appropriate investigations in aid thereof, is hardly debatable. The existence of such power has never been questioned by this Court. (360 U.S. 109, 127 (1959)).

In view of these statements, how can it be said that congressional maintenance of an investigating committee in the area of internal security indicates lack of faith in democratic society?

The Supreme Court certainly had our own democratic society in mind when, in 1889, it ruled in the *Chinese Exclusion* case:

To preserve its independence, and give security against foreign aggression and encroachment, is the highest duty of every nation, and to attain these ends nearly all other considerations are to be subordinated. It matters not in what form such aggression and encroachment comes * * *.

More to the point, the Supreme Court repeated these very words in a recent case dealing with Communist activities in this country and the right of democratic society to protect itself from such activities. It quoted the above words in its June 5, 1961, decision upholding the constitutionality of the registration provisions of the Internal Security Act, a disclosure statute enacted by the Congress as a result of the disclosures of this committee.

Democratic societies would soon perish if they did not have—and exercise—the right to preserve the integrity of "full and free" democratic discussion by disclosing the aims, nature, and identity of those who utilize constitutional rights only to destroy them.

ALLEGATION NO. 11

Paragraph 18 of House rule XI (which creates the Committee on Un-American Activities and gives it its powers) should be repealed and legislative matters relating to internal security should be placed under the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction could then be amended to include sabotage, insurrection, and other overt actions relating to internal security. If this is done, however, the resolution should specifically exclude propaganda or other forms

of expression or association for such purposes.

REPLY

During the organization of the 88th Congress—1963—the Rules Committee held hearings on a resolution which called for transferring the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Judiciary Committee. It rejected the resolution by a vote of 12 to 1.

During the 79th Congress, as previously mentioned, a Joint Committee on Reorganization of the Legislature was formed. The committee held 5 months of hearings which comprised the most thorough analysis and review that has ever been made of the Congress, its functions and the organizational structure required to carry them out as efficiently as possible. The committee's extensive hearings and debates culminated in the *Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946*.

Certainly, if there were real merit in the idea of transferring this committee's functions to the Judiciary Committee, it would have been proposed and thoroughly debated at that time. Actually, however, in the extensive hearings and debate which preceded the enactment of this law, it was never even mentioned. To the contrary, the House took the step of making the Committee on Un-American Activities, by statute, a standing committee.

During the debate on the *Reorganization Act*, one Member of the House did propose that the Committee on Un-American Activities be eliminated as a standing committee. Senator *MONROE*, then a Member of the House and the floor leader on the bill, as well as vice chairman of the Committee on Reorganization, objected on the grounds that the proposal had nothing to do with the "functional reorganization of Congress" and was no more than "a political or ideological consideration." The proposal was overwhelmingly rejected.

In view of the fact that the petition to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee does not advance a single valid reason—theoretical or practical—for transferring its functions to the Judiciary Committee, the fact that the Rules Committee rejected the proposal just a few years ago and it was never even entertained in the comprehensive 1946 reorganization of the Congress, there is certainly no reason for making the change today.

On the other hand, there are a number of compelling practical reasons why the change should not be made.

The first is that the Judiciary Committee, as every Member of the House knows, is already tremendously overburdened.

During the debate on the *Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946*, Mr. *CELLER*, then, as now, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, protested that the reorganization bill would reduce the members on the Judiciary Committee from 27 to 25, even while imposing more work on the committee by giving it jurisdiction previously exercised by four standing committees.

He pointed out that as a result of its "avalanche of business," the Judiciary Committee had already been divided into five subcommittees and all five were then

behind in their work because of the "tremendous number of bills" which were continually referred to the committee. He enumerated the additional duties being imposed on the Judiciary Committee, their complexity, the hundreds of additional bills it would have to consider each year because of them, and then stated: "How we are going to do all that work with 25 members is beyond my comprehension."

That was 20 years ago. What is the situation today as far as the Judiciary Committee is concerned? The committee's membership has been expanded to 35. Despite this, everyone knows that it is still the most overworked committee in the House. It now has 19 separate subjects within its jurisdiction. As chairman of four of its subcommittees, I can say without fear of contradiction that it is having difficulty—and has always had difficulty—keeping up with all the work that is assigned to it.

In the 88th Congress, 5,476 of the 15,299 measures introduced in the House were referred to the Judiciary Committee. This was 36.4 percent of the total. In the first session of this Congress, 38.5 percent of all measures introduced were referred to the Judiciary Committee. Moreover, during the 173 days the House was in session, the Judiciary Committee and its subcommittees met in public and executive sessions 184 times—more than once a day.

If the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities were transferred to the already overworked Judiciary Committee, matters of vital concern to our country would suffer—all of the 19 matters which are now in the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, and also the very essential task of investigating subversive activities.

The procedure established by the House for the investigation of activities designed to undermine our Government has worked well for 28 years. Why change it now for a new procedure which might create problems in this area which have not existed in the past?

The most dangerous element contained in this recommendation is the suggestion that the Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction be amended to include only overt actions relating to internal security and that it specifically exclude propaganda or other forms of expression or association for such purposes.

Implementation of this recommendation would deprive the Judiciary Committee of the power to effectively investigate many forms of subversive activity.

Revolutions do not occur spontaneously and overnight. They are the culmination of years of careful planning and work which largely involve operations in the fields of propaganda, expression, and association on the part of democracy's enemies. Such operations, in fact, are essential to the development of revolutions and the tearing down of governments.

Emerson wrote: "Words are also actions, and actions are a kind of words."

Lenin said: "A word is also a deed."

Propaganda, speech and "association" are key elements in developing revolutionists, recruiting spies and saboteurs,

penetrating and undermining institutions, destroying faith in the established Government and in numerous other activities used by the Communists in their efforts to subvert nations.

As the courts have repeatedly held, there is no requirement under the U.S. Constitution for this country to wait for an overt act to take place, directed at or promoting its overthrow, before it has a right to take steps to preserve itself and thus the rights and freedoms of all its citizens. All forms of preparation for revolution, including propaganda and association, are the legitimate concern of the Congress, and it has been the judgment of the House for 26 years that the House should vigorously demonstrate this concern. To fail to do so now would be to invite destruction by the most skilled revolution-fomenting force the world has ever known.

In summary, what we have in this proposal, carefully concealed in the high-sounding phrases, is a recommendation that the House neglect its constitutionally imposed duty of taking all reasonable steps possible to protect this Nation against the totalitarian subverters of democracy.

ALLEGATION NO. 12

The committee's files, which contain "often inaccurate" data about millions of Americans, should be transferred to the Archives. All Government officials and agencies, as well as the public, should be denied access to them for 50 years, because these files are "destructive of the sovereign rights of the individual and a perversion of the governmental process," and "self-respecting citizens of a democratic country cannot allow their representatives in government to keep dossiers on their beliefs, ideas, political views, or associations."

REPLY

First of all, I want to make it very clear—and I am happy to say this—that the committee's files do not contain information about "millions" of Americans, or even on 1 million Americans. I do not know the precise figure, but the number is much less than that.

Now, as far as the accuracy of this information is concerned, let me say that a mere description of the nature of the committee's files refutes the claim that the data in them is "often inaccurate."

The committee's files fall into two categories—public and investigative. The investigative files contain sworn testimony received in executive sessions of the committee and confidential information developed by the committee staff. These files are accessible only to the committee's investigators and other key staff personnel. Information in them is not made available to the public or to Congress, except when a majority of the committee votes to release executive testimony. It is used only to provide leads for committee investigations and is revealed only in hearings of the committee in which the persons concerned have the opportunity to deny, qualify, or refute it.

The committee's public files, collected over a period of almost 28 years, are one of this country's most comprehensive

sources of information on Communist and other subversive activities.

They are composed of the published hearings and reports of this committee, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and other committees of the Congress, the Subversive Activities Control Board, State and municipal investigating committees, court proceedings, and official reports of the executive branch agencies of the U.S. Government. They also include extensive collections of U.S. Communist Party and international Communist newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, and documents; flyers, handbills and other material released by the Communist Party and other subversive groups; and letterheads, publications, releases, and flyers of hundreds of Communist fronts. They include, in addition, books on communism written by recognized authorities and an extensive collection of articles published in reputable newspapers in all parts of the country, in major U.S. magazines and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If the information contained in these documents is "often inaccurate," I can only say that we might as well give up all hope of ever obtaining accurate information on any subject anywhere and at any time. In addition—if we accept the completely unfounded claim in this petition—we might as well give up hope of obtaining justice in our courts, reliable information for enacting legislation through congressional hearings, the truth about the nature of certain organizations from the Subversive Activities Control Board, and any truth at all, not only about communism from the Communists themselves, but about all other matters and subjects from newspapers, magazines, scholarly works and all normal sources of information. In short, the pursuit of knowledge is a waste of time.

On the question of the accuracy of the committee's files, I would make this further point:

President Truman, in Executive Order No. 9835 of 1947, instituting the loyalty program, directed that the committee's files be checked in the Government's investigation into the backgrounds of all applicants for Federal employment.

This directive would certainly not have been issued if the President and/or other responsible officials of the executive branch who are in a position to know the facts had reason to believe the files contain "often inaccurate" data.

Although Executive Order 9835 has been supplanted by President Eisenhower's Order No. 10450 of 1953, the executive branch has continued the policy instituted by President Truman. Each year, thousands of visits are made to committee offices by representatives of the Civil Service Commission, FBI, intelligence branches of our armed services, and other agencies for assistance in their all-important job of protecting the security of this Nation.

The nature of the data in the committee's public files is such that it would be a senseless move to bury the files in the Archives for 50 years in an attempt to keep the information in them secret.

This information, with intelligent and careful research, is actually available to anyone in the country.

All other issues aside, placing the files in the Archives with a complete ban on any access to them by anyone, would be the grossest form of anti-intellectualism.

Moreover, to keep from anyone the knowledge contained in the committee's public files, it would be necessary not only to bury them in the Archives, but to go to the ridiculous length of removing from all public and private libraries and all other sources—and destroying—all the congressional, executive branch, State, municipal, and foreign government publications mentioned above. It would be necessary to destroy all back copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and files of national magazines. It would be necessary to remove from public libraries all bound volumes and microfilm copies of the New York Times and similar newspapers; to stop the New York Times from publishing its index and to stop all major newspapers from keeping the "morgues" which they have been keeping for many years on many thousands of American citizens. The same, of course, would apply to all public and private collections of Communist newspapers, magazines, and other publications.

There is no foundation in law—or in reason—for the assertion that the maintenance of the committee's files is destructive of individual rights, a perversion of governmental process and something which no self-respecting citizen can tolerate.

The opposite is true. As a matter of self protection, all democratic governments and societies, have investigative agencies operating on various levels. This is a part of the normal legislative, security, and law-enforcement process. Further, no investigative agency, no matter what its area of jurisdiction, can operate effectively and do the job it is supposed to do without files containing background information on the organizations, movements, and individuals with which it is concerned. The Supreme Court has held that as far as organizations are concerned, their past history is pertinent to their present nature and activities:

Where the current character of an organization and the nature of its connections with others is at issue, of course, past conduct is pertinent. Institutions, like other organisms, are predominantly what their past has made them. History provides the illuminating context within which the implications of present conduct may be known. (*The Communist Party Case*, 367 U.S. 1, 69.)

Other courts have made the same determination as regards both organizations and individuals. In the case of the Communist Party of the United States against the Subversive Activities Control Board, for example, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia pointed out:

[I]t is rarely, if ever, possible to prove present nature by some instantaneous, contemporaneous fact, totally ignoring the whole of the past. Not only is the past clearly pertinent, it may be quite material to a determination of present nature. Whether it is material depends upon whether there is affirmative evidence of a

departure from the established past. In the ordinary affairs of life and in ordinary litigation, if a person or an organization is shown to have had over many years a certain policy and program, and no more is shown, the conclusion is clearly indicated that he or it has the same policy and program in the present. (223 F. 2d 531, 570.)

This committee would be guilty of negligence if it did not maintain its extensive files on organizations and individuals. Without this background information about the past activities of organizations and individuals, it would not be in a position to make sound and reasoned judgments about the present nature and aims of numerous organizations and the actions of persons associated with them. Lacking the data with which to make such judgments, it would be incapable of performing the duty assigned it by the House.

In *McGrain* against *Daugherty*, previously quoted in part, the Supreme Court stated:

A legislative body cannot legislate wisely or effectively in the absence of information respecting the conditions which the legislation itself is intended to affect or change; and where the legislative body does not itself possess the requisite information—which not infrequently is true—recourse must be had to others who do possess it. (273 U.S. 135.)

The Court made this ruling in upholding the right of Congress, when it lacks information essential to legislation, to carry out investigations and compel testimony to obtain it. But surely, if it is

constitutional—that is, democratic—to investigate and compel testimony, there is nothing undemocratic about collecting already published information in aid of the legislative process.

The great value of the committee's files is that, through 28 years of effort and the expenditure of large sums of money, all the previously referred to and widely scattered public information on subversive activities has been collected in one place, filed and indexed, so that it is readily available, not only to this committee in preparing its investigations and making its recommendations, but also to the Congress as a whole to aid it in the enactment of legislation.

The committee's public files are the main source of information on Communist and other un-American activities for the Congress. Over the years, they have been the source of information contained in tens of thousands of individually prepared reports that have been provided to Members.

In the 6 years from 1960 through 1965, Members of Congress have made more than 16,000 requests for information. Staff members filling these requests have made information checks on more than 56,000 individuals, organizations and periodicals. Also during this period, staff members have compiled and submitted some 18,000 written reports. These figures do not include tens of thousands of information checks made by committee investigators or other staff members for research purposes, as with information which is used in committee hearings.

	Requests from Members of Congress	Information checks on individuals ¹	Information checks on organizations and periodicals ¹	Reports by HCUA staff members	Visits by executive branch representatives
1960	2,200	4,566	1,900	1,945	2,000
1961	3,200	5,100	2,000	2,500	2,100
1962	3,800	7,500	3,900	3,747	2,000
1963	2,400	8,200	4,200	3,800	2,000
1964	2,300	4,200	2,500	2,400	2,300
1965	2,400	7,100	4,900	4,100	2,400
Total	16,300	36,666	19,400	18,492	12,800

¹ Requests from Members of Congress do not correspond directly with the number of information checks since requests from Members indicate only the number of letters received. Each letter may have several references which must be checked. Also, the number of checks do not indicate the instances when information requested was found in the files. All checks are included since figures indicate the number of inquiries into committee files and not the results of these inquiries.

In addition, the files were used nearly 13,000 times by representatives of various agencies of the executive branch of Government during this period. During any one year, officials from the executive branch may come from as many as 25 different agencies.

The above demonstrates the valuable service provided by the committee for both Members of Congress and other agencies of the Federal Government. To remove these files from use would be a senseless and dangerous action.

No court has ever found that the maintenance of the committee's files is destructive of individual rights or a perversion of the governmental process. On the contrary, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has held that this is evidence of the legislative purpose of the committee's investigations. In a 1960 decision upholding the contempt conviction of a witness who had appeared before the committee, the

court found that the legislative purpose of the hearing in which the witness was subpoenaed to testify was "amply supported." As part of the evidence for this conclusion, the court pointed out:

A large collection of material and exhibits is maintained by the committee in connection with its constituted duties in order to furnish reference service not only to the committee's own members and staff in its investigations and hearings, but also to every Member of Congress who submits a written request for information in that field." (*Gojack v. United States*, 280 Fed. 2d, 678.)

The committee's maintenance of files on subversive activities, organizations and individuals is no more a perversion of the governmental process or destructive of individual rights than is a police department's maintenance of criminal files.

To transfer the committee's files to the Archives and hold them secret there for

50 years would be to deprive both the executive and legislative branches of our Government of one of their most valuable sources of information on subversive movements and activities in this country. It would impair the ability of both branches to carry out their constitutionally assigned duty of protecting this country from its enemies. It would also have the effect of keeping from the American people the truth about subversive movements which they must have to protect their liberties.

Implementing this recommendation would, at the same time, be a tremendous help to the Communists and all other totalitarians and subversives in this country. It would be so inimical to the best interests of the Nation, however, that it is difficult for me to conceive how anyone could make such a proposal seriously.

Even if the day should come when there would be no need for congressional concern with subversive activities, it is my hope that the committee's files would be retained by the House, if for no other reason than to remind the people of this country that, while there may be temporary lulls in the threats to democracy, they can never afford to let down their guard permanently.

ALLEGATION NO. 13

The committee continuously and flagrantly violates its own rules.

REPLY

This charge is generally made without specific citation of how we are supposed to violate our rules. The usual charge is made that we violate our rules by disclosing to the press the names of subpoenaed witnesses. No evidence has ever been presented to specifically buttress this charge. I know of no instance where there has been a leak but I do know I have heard Chairman WILLIS state flatly a dozen times that if there ever is such a leak from a staff member they would be fired instantaneously. More often than not, it would appear that the parties themselves leak the "news" so they can start a campaign of vilification against the committee, raise money for their defense funds and, in addition, bring this specious and unfounded charge before the committee when they testify.

Mr. Lawrence Speiser, of the ACLU, brought one of these specious charges against our committee which was very soundly refuted by Chairman WILLIS. At one point in his testimony, Mr. Speiser stated that he thought House rule XI, 26(m) has been "flagrantly violated continuously" by the Committee on Un-American Activities. He stated that he had represented "over 100 people" before the HCUA and that he had never known the rule to be followed by the committee. Chairman WILLIS shot this big lie technique down very quickly and stated:

I want to say, first, that I have had a careful check made of the record, and it reveals that Mr. Speiser has represented a total of 39 witnesses who have appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities—33 in public session and 6 in executive session. Therefore, that part of his statement about the number of witnesses he has

represented before the committee is less than half true.

Next, I would like to point out that the most recent appearance of Mr. Speiser before the committee as counsel for subpoenaed witnesses was during an executive session on December 7, 1964, at which time he represented Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen. During that session, because Mr. Speiser had raised the issue beforehand in a letter to the committee, there was considerable discussion of rule 26(m) and its applicability to the appearances of the witnesses he represented. The issue was not resolved then and there. The committee took one position on the matter, and he another.

What finally happened? His clients were subsequently cited for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions of the committee and were tried and convicted here in the district court. Rule 26(m) was one of the issues at point in that trial, and the ruling of the court upheld the view that the committee had complied with 26(m) and that Mr. Speiser's claim that it had not done so was unfounded. Therefore, when he told this committee that he believed the Committee on Un-American Activities had never observed rule 26(m), he was flying in the face of a very recent court decision to the contrary.

Of course, as I point out later, this decision was overturned by the Supreme Court but on grounds which had nothing to do with the operation of HCUA. As far as the rule 26(m) is concerned, I can say that since becoming a member of the committee, it has been my experience that Chairman WILLIS and all other presiding officers of our committee have bent over backwards to comply with this and other rules and without exception, I believe, they have done so.

It is a difficult rule to interpret in some respects. In our efforts to see that it is correctly observed in all our proceedings, we have discussed its applicability in regard to particular hearings and witnesses for hours in the course of committee meetings.

When asked to cite a case involving a 26(m) violation with which he was personally familiar, Mr. Speiser stated:

The only time that I know of an executive session involving the House Un-American Activities Committee, there was not an executive session in advance—it was an executive session involving the calling of a witness who had been before the committee on a number of occasions before and had refused to answer questions. What prompted the committee's curiosity, the latest time, was that he had been awarded a fellowship by the Woodrow Wilson Political Science Fellowship program. The committee called him in executive session, and again interrogated him about the same kind of things that he had been asked about before, and then leaked his testimony to the newspapers—it was not a leak, one of the committee members came out of the committee hearing and told the newspapers that he had refused to answer questions on similar occasions. Now, there was no public session after that. But as far as following that rule about executive session, of course, I have never known of any occasion where I have represented over 100 people before the House Un-American Activities Committee—I have never known that rule to be followed by them.

Chairman WILLIS again showed the inaccuracy of the ACLU spokesman and stated:

Now, the record shows, as I have indicated before, that Mr. Speiser has represented six

witnesses who have testified before the committee in executive session. So his words, "The only time that I know of an executive session involving the House Un-American Activities Committee" were also inaccurate. He has actually taken part in four other such sessions (in one, he represented two witnesses).

Mr. Speiser did not name the witness he represented on the occasion he described but, as his above-quoted testimony indicates, he certainly painted a rather lurid picture of that session and one that is highly derogatory of the committee. Because he also painted a very inaccurate picture, this record should reflect what actually happened.

The matter he was referring to was an executive session of the committee held on July 22, 1959, at which Clinton Edward Jencks, represented by Mr. Speiser, testified in response to a subpoena. Over 2 months earlier, on May 13, 1959, the then chairman of the committee, the late Francis E. Walter, had announced publicly that the committee would look into the grant, by the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Foundation, of Princeton, N.J., of a fellowship for Mr. Jencks to study to be an economics teacher at the University of California in Berkeley.

The committee had made this determination because Jencks had not only been identified as a member of the Communist Party, but had been convicted in a Federal court and sentenced to 5 years in prison for filing a false non-Communist affidavit under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Jencks had escaped a prison term, however, on a technicality. On his appeal, the Supreme Court ruled that he should be given a new trial because, in the original trial, his attorney was not granted access to secret FBI files related to the case for use in cross-examination. Rather than turn its files over to the attorney who was representing Jencks, a man who had been identified as a Communist Party member, the Justice Department dismissed the case against him. The Court decision in the Jencks case led the Congress to enact a statute restricting the use of FBI files in trials.

As indicated, Jencks testified on July 22, 1959, in response to a committee subpoena. At the end of that executive hearing, former Representative Gordon Scherer, chairman of the subcommittee, advised the press of what had taken place in the hearing. This included the fact that Jencks had admitted that in applying for the fellowship, he had attempted to give the Woodrow Wilson Foundation the impression that he had not falsely signed a non-Communist affidavit. Representative Scherer also informed the press that Jencks had refused to answer when asked by the committee if this impression was truthful.

So much for the facts in the case.

Now, Mr. Speiser said that in this executive session, the committee interrogated Jencks, "who had been before the committee on a number of occasions before, about the same kind of things that he had been asked about before."

The truth is that Jencks had never previously testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities so the committee could not possibly have asked him the same questions it had "on a number of occasions before."

Furthermore, Representative Scherer, as chairman of the subcommittee which received Jenck's testimony, had the right, after the session and with the approval of the subcommittee, to reveal what had taken place in the executive hearing. There was certainly nothing wrong in his doing this, despite Mr. Speiser's implication that there was.

And how could Mr. Scherer, as Mr. Speiser testified, have "told the newspapers that he—Jenck—had refused to answer questions on similar occasions?" Jenck, as I have already stated, had never appeared before the committee before.

Mr. Speiser protested, "Now, there was no public session after that." These words indicate that, even after the court decision in the Allen-Wilson case, Mr. Speiser apparently does not comprehend the meaning of rule XI, 26(m). Neither that rule nor any other rule of the House requires a committee to hear a witness in public after he has been heard in an executive session.

ALLEGATION NO. 14

The committee subpoenas witnesses to testify in public sessions knowing in advance they will not answer any questions.

REPLY

The fact is, of course, that neither the Committee on Un-American Activities, nor any other committee of the Congress, can know in advance just what any witness will do when he appears in either executive or public session. Some witnesses, after giving their names and addresses, will refuse to answer all questions. Some will answer nearly all questions asked them, refusing to reply to only a few. Some will answer all questions of a certain type but refuse to answer all questions of another kind or type. Sometimes a witness who has refused to answer questions in executive session will answer them, or some of them in public. Sometimes the opposite happens.

We have had experiences in which a witness has testified fully in executive session, has stated he will do the same in public session, and then, when the public session has been held, has refused to answer any questions at all.

Based on our investigative knowledge of certain witnesses—and sometimes also on staff interviews with them—we may estimate that they will probably act in a certain manner before the committee, either testifying fully or not at all. But when the session is actually held, we find that our estimate concerning the probable conduct of the witnesses was wrong.

There have been occasions when counsel representing witnesses subpoenaed to testify before the committee have advised us that their clients would follow a certain course of action in their appearance. Yet, when their clients have actually appeared before the committee, they have not done what their counsel had advised us they would do. So, despite what these critics say, we do not know, and cannot be certain in advance, just how any witness will respond to questions asked in either public or executive sessions, and I believe that any Member of the Congress who has served on an investigating committee will bear me out on this point.

More important than this, however, is the fact that rule XI, 26(g), of the House states that:

All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, and all other committees, would be obligated by this rule to hear witnesses in public session even if they could be absolutely certain that the witnesses would refuse to answer every single question put to them.

Congress cannot legislate on the basis of confidential investigative work done by its committee staffs. When such investigation reveals that a person has associated with certain groups and engaged in certain activities—whether those activities and associations involve gangsterism, graft, subversive activities, or any other activities in which the Congress has a legislative interest—the results of the investigation must be placed in a public record to assist the Congress in its legislative deliberations. Moreover, fairness dictates that they be placed in the public record through the appearance of the person in question, so that he will have the opportunity—even if he says and the committee feels certain he will not answer any questions—to deny, refute, qualify, or otherwise comment on his activities and associations as developed in the investigation.

If we were to accept the implication that no congressional committee should ever call a witness when it believes he will refuse to answer questions, it would mean the end of all congressional investigation of activities inimical to the national interest. Racketeers, gangsters, grafters, subversives, and all other persons of such stripe, when subpoenaed to testify, would only have to inform the committee that they will refuse to answer any of its questions. They would then not be called as witnesses, and there would be no investigative hearings at all. This would undermine the very foundation of the whole legislative process.

I know of no instance where a witness has been called from whom we were not sure we could get helpful information pertinent to our legislative inquiry if the witness would choose to cooperate. The fact they often choose not to cooperate does not lessen our obligation to endeavor to gain the information which we need to fulfill our legislative mandate.

ALLEGATION NO. 15

The committee spends its time entirely investigating organizations of the left, including communism, but does not give its attention to extremists of the right.

REPLY

While it can be properly argued that fascism is a totalitarian extreme of the left, it is generally and I believe erroneously considered to be on the right. The Ku Klux Klan is considered as an extremist group of the right. Our 1965 and 1966 hearings on the KKK certainly indicated this charge is unfounded. The following statement of Mayer Newfield on behalf of the Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith would seem to put this

matter in proper perspective. He said, when testifying:

At the outset, Mr. Chairman, we want to commend you and the other members of this committee for your courage in attacking the problem of Klan terror in the series of hearings. After all, where terror reigns no one, not even a Congressman, is immune. We want also to associate ourselves with the remarks made yesterday by the Attorney General and the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who praised the careful and thorough investigation of the Klan which your committee conducted of the Klan over a period of more than 6 months.

These hearings have helped to spread on the uncontroverted public record the shocking story of the Klan's organized terrorist activities. In so doing, the committee has performed a most useful function and made clear the need for remedial legislation to curb Klan terrorism and intimidation.

The record is very clear. HCUA has trapped Communists in Government, sensitive industries and organized labor, the Nazis and Fascists at their recruiting centers and propaganda mills and agents of the Japanese before World War II. HCUA focused its attention on Manfred Zapp, Fritz Kuhn, Earl Browder, G. Wilhelm Kunze, William Z. Foster, William Pelley, Alger Hiss, Robert Shelton with equal vigor. It is fair to say that world communism, not fascism, has ranked as the chief un-American activity in this country since 1945. This should come as no surprise to anyone since the forces of fascism were defeated and no one seriously contends there is a vital fascist force in the United States today. The American Nazi Party is a paper organization not worthy, in my opinion, of investigation. Our apparent preoccupation with communism can be answered simply: Only Communists are a part of a world conspiracy which has the potential to destroy us. No other force or "ism" is in that position. It therefore is essential that we spend a great share of our time on the machinations of communism and it would seem that this will be true until freedom prevails over their ideology.

ALLEGATION NO. 16

Proof of the illegal nature of HCUA comes from the poor record the committee has in having its contempt citations upheld by the courts.

REPLY

The record is not poor. In those cases where contempt citations have been overturned, in almost every instance the courts have announced new guidelines or new technicalities with which HCUA would then comply by changing the rules of procedure. To my personal viewpoint, it often seems that the court "stretches the point" quite far. Nonetheless, we always endeavor to make our rules and procedures conform.

A good example of a contempt citation being overturned was the 2-1 court of appeals reversal of the Donna Allen, Dagmar Wilson, and Russ Nixon citations. In this case, Judge Leventhal said Speaker McCormack erred when he automatically certified the contempt charges to the U.S. attorney's office without giving his personal consideration to the issues leading to the allegations.

This took the Speaker and the Parliamentarian by surprise and we may yet see a reversal of this decision. The example is clear, however, that more often than not it is some technicality such as this rather than any slap at how HCUA conducts its affairs.

ALLEGATION NO. 17

The HCUA conducts a circus and there are usually riots which indicate that these hearings are unpopular.

REPLY

To the extent that there is disorder, and this has been the order of the day, it is the result of the improper and illegal conduct of those who are opposed to the committee and have as their goal the thwarting of its work. For a long time, the procedure in attacking our committee was largely one of taking the fifth amendment and refusing to cooperate. After the success of the 1960 protest riots in San Francisco, the tactic has been to picket, jeer, and create disorder in the hope that this would reflect on the committee itself. The committee cannot and will not be intimidated and the fact that an organized uproar and riot at our hearings has taken place during the Vietcong, Cuban, and other hearings should not deter the committee from its work. Mob rule cannot dominate. The committee endeavors to maintain order but in most cases it appears that exhibitionists and provocateurs are well planted to foment disorder.

In the interest of fairplay, it might be advisable to review several cases in which unfair methods were used during hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Seven clergymen who attended the committee's hearings in San Francisco, May 12 to 14, 1960, in which students rioted against the committee, issued a statement concerning the outbreak which said in part:

What we witnessed was utterly fantastic. The shameful demonstration against law and order and against this duly constituted committee of the Congress defies description. We sat in the rear of the room on a raised platform where we could easily observe the proceedings, right in the midst of the student demonstrators.

We were sitting where we were able to observe the giving of instructions by the riot leaders who had gained access to the room. The *Daily Californian*, which was distributed widely at the scene, gave explicit instructions on the front page of the Thursday issue on exactly how to harass the committee. They were told to laugh out loud at every incident that appeared to be amusing in order to make the Congressmen look ridiculous. These well-disciplined mobsters laughed on the dotted line and obeyed their masters to the last jeer. We watched a national committeeman for the party line up a dozen Communists near the railing and throw every sneer, invective, abusive language, vile profanity and fiendish charge at the Congressmen they could conceive. For nearly 15 minutes at one point, this lawless crowd of students from the university, together with party cadres, had the chambers almost in their control. The students, comprising the rear third of the audience stood upon their seats and yelled, jeered, hissed, and scoffed at the Congressmen. It was almost complete breakdown of law and order. We witnessed more violations of the law in 15 minutes than we have seen in 15 years.

Another specific and detailed account of unfair methods used against the House Committee on Un-American Activities was provided by Miss Eileen Shore, a summer intern in the office of Congressman JAMES F. BATTIN, of Montana. Miss Shore was present during HCUA hearings investigating organizations that were aiding the Viet Cong, hearings in which demonstrations against the committee were carried out in the caucus room in the Old House Office Building in August of this year. Note again the planned precision with which the protestors sought to disrupt the hearings. Miss Shore's statement as it appeared in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 18, 1966, page A4375, follows:

Attending the hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee was the most educational and shocking experience of my summer in Washington. Previously I had doubts about this committee and its expressed aims, which had been the brunt of much criticism. The constant cries of witch-hunt, coercion and character defamation seemed too loud and too constant not to be valid, at least to some degree. The meeting I attended Wednesday, August 17, vividly demonstrated to me that the anti-HUAC movement is highly organized and highly sophisticated in the techniques they employ to discredit this Congressional Committee.

The first witness of the day was unfriendly to the Committee. Showing open contempt for the members of the Committee and their questions, he proceeded to expound the "philosophy" of the Progressive Labor Party, a Peiping-oriented organization. The witness proudly proclaimed himself a Communist and was so unresponsive to questions of the Committee that he was dismissed. As he rose from his chair, he shouted "Get out of Vietnam," setting off demonstrations from a number of spectators.

When the Committee introduced a friendly witness, the lawyers representing the unfriendly witnesses subpoenaed by the Committee, raised strenuous objection. The objections were heard by the Chairman and overruled. When Chairman POOL repeatedly requested that the lawyers take their seats, they refused and one, a Mr. Arthur Kinoy began shouting and shaking his fist at the Chairman. Again and again, Mr. POOL directed Kinoy to be in order, but to no avail. Finally the Marshals were directed by the Committee to remove Kinoy and he was taken, still shouting, from the room. Immediately another lawyer, Kinoy's partner stated that unless Mr. Kinoy was returned all lawyers representing unfriendly witnesses would walk out, leaving their clients without counsel. Under the rule of the Committee, a witness does not have to testify if he is not represented by counsel. Kinoy had already been arrested; consequently the lawyers left the room.

This chain of events is remarkable for its perfect organization. Before Kinoy's partner had left the Committee room, after delivering his protest statement, his statement had already been mimeographed and was being distributed. Seated among the gallery of spectators, made up partly of Congressional staff but in the majority by a large group of bearded, studiously disheveled young men and women, I and another member of Mr. BATTIN's staff watched and heard the carefully laid plans of the demonstrators. The outbursts were timed to give maximum publicity and affect in the Committee room. These were no spontaneous outbursts of outrage. The people involved were tightly organized and disciplined. They exhibited contempt and disregard for Congress, the Committee and its members, and the law.

Another facet of the hearing, the press coverage, shocked me only slightly less than the hearing itself. The *Washington Post*, while reporting facts, also neglected facts that would expose the organization and purpose of the demonstrators and the lack of spontaneity, such as the statement printed prior to delivery or the incident that allegedly prompted it.

From observing these demonstrations, it seems to me that they reveal a danger that must be dealt with immediately.

These organizations are highly organized. They are not hindered by law, for which they show contempt. They have no moral system that prevents them from employing any method to achieve their ends, which are ultimately the overthrow of the government as we know it today. Demonstrations against involvement in Vietnam are but a small part of the activities for the Progressive Labor Party and other similar organizations. They will take part in any action that will weaken the law of the United States and the foundations upon which these laws are laid. They lend active support to the Vietcong by sending blood, food, and other supplies to North Vietnam. The House Un-American Activities Committee has called hearings to investigate these movements and to ascertain the danger they represent. And they are dangerous, because they are determined. They will take advantage of any loophole, and weakness in the law and turn it to their advantage.

Witnessing this Committee in action has removed the doubts which I had about its function. The witnesses and demonstrators I saw in one morning of hearings are the best testimony for the need of such a Committee. At this time, organizations such as the Progressive Labor Party are aiding enemies of the United States with impunity. Their openly expressed aims are to overthrow the United States as a democratic society. The Congress and the people of the United States cannot tolerate such a menace to their country. I think the House Un-American Activities Committee is a most valuable deterrent to these organizations and must be allowed to function as a duly appointed Committee of Congress.

ALLEGATION NO. 18

The committee spends a lot of money, more than other committees which seem to turn out more legislation.

REPLY

Other committees do not deal with subjects which engender the hostility of the organized opposition which is the usual rule in HCUA's mandate. Because we are concerned with communism, we know we will evoke a protest. We usually are dealing with hostile witnesses whether they be a Robert Shelton of the Klan or a Communist. We therefore must do our advance work so we know that we are on sound ground. If we were to do otherwise we would be accused of conducting a fishing expedition. When Mr. Shelton does not answer, we must have at least partial answers ourselves which will help develop our record. We are in the strange position of needing to know in advance, through fieldwork and rigorous study by staff, about our subject. This takes many investigators who must work painstakingly to gather the information needed. This is the best safeguard for witnesses. It obviously is far more costly than it is for the Ways and Means Committee to call in witnesses for and against a tax bill and while opinions might vary, they nonetheless have the cooperation of those who testify. HCUA is not in the

same situation and cannot be compared with other committees.

ALLEGATION NO. 19

The committee has harassed Americans who work for racial equality and justice.

REPLY

Only one who has not reviewed committee hearings and reports relating to minority groups can honestly make this statement.

Just the opposite is true. The committee, in the field of subversive activities, before and after the above statement was made, has endeavored to publicize first-hand experiences of those who have been engaged in the area of civil rights as their experiences related to subversive elements seeking to distort and detour justified civil rights purposes. As the American Negro has long been a prime target of the greatest and most dangerous subversive force in the United States, the Communist Party, this aspect of the civil rights movement has quite naturally received much of the committee's attention.

Anyone who has made an honest and responsible effort to evaluate the committee's work in its relation to the American Negro can appreciate the hypocritical manner in which the Communist Party uses the American Negro to further Communist ends.

In 1954, the committee published a report, "The American Negro in the Communist Party," which included the testimony of half a dozen Negroes who had held official positions in the Communist Party and who had broken with it—all of whom had testified that the Communist Party does all in its power to promote race hatred and tension, rather than racial equality, in the United States. Despite the efforts of the party over the years to entice and ensnare the Negro people into its trap, Negro American citizens have overwhelmingly refused to be fooled. As the committee stated in the above-mentioned report:

The fact that the Communist conspiracy has experienced so little success in attracting the American Negro to its cause reflects favorably on the loyalty and integrity of the vast majority of the 15,000,000 (1954) Negro citizens.

In later years the committee has sought to warn the Negro people that the Communist Party speaks to them with a forked tongue—while it ostensibly works with the Negro to help him attain his legal, social, and financial aspirations, the Communist Party in reality uses the hopes and dreams of the Negro to further Communist aims of world domination.

In February of 1960, in committee hearings on Communist activity among youth, a young Negro youth who had recently broken with the party testified:

I went into the party with the idea that the Communist Party was the solution to the Negro people's problem, but as my experience in the Communist Party I find out that the Communist Party wasn't a party for the Negro people, that the Communist Party have one of the worse discriminations in their own party themselves.

If the Communist Party can use the Negro people as a tool and use them for their

own advantage, the Communist Party don't give a darn about the Negro people . . . and I also witnessed discrimination in the party. If something happened to the Negro people, the Communist Party they would be the first ones to jump up and say, "We must do this and we must do that." And then if the Communist Party find out . . . the Government of this country changed things around and worked the things in favor of the Negro people, it seems like the Communist Party they get sad and they want to drop the issue altogether. In other words, the Communist Party want to see the things really keep on happening to the Negro people so they can use this as a weapon to try to rally the masses of the Negro people around the Communist Party.

Another excellent example of Communist duplicity toward the Negro people was made public by the House Committee on Un-American Activities through its hearings on "Communist Activities in the Cleveland, Ohio, Area" in June 1962. A Negro housewife, Mrs. Julia C. Brown, knowing little about Communist chicanery but interested in civic and political affairs, consented to help in the campaign for city council of a candidate who was represented as being for better housing, civil rights, and so forth. Later Mrs. Brown was asked to join a civil rights organization which she later found out to be a branch of the Communist Party in Cleveland. In her testimony before the committee, Mrs. Brown told of her experience with Communist discrimination as had Albert Gaillard, the Negro youth mentioned above:

The Communist Party discriminated in the Southeast Section and only white people were members, but there were colored and white, they were integrated, in the Northeast Section, so that made me go to the Northeast Section because they were discriminating in the Southeast Section.

In less than a year's time, in August 1948, Mrs. Brown left the Communist Party, for in that short time she had found that "the Communist Party was a conspiracy and trying to destroy my country." In 1951 the FBI approached Mrs. Brown to reenter the party and she consented, remaining within the party ranks until May 1960, when she left because of bad health.

The testimony of Mrs. Brown was especially valuable because in her experiences she provided a concrete case of the Communist doctrine of reforms in action. The Sojourners for Truth and Justice was a Negro women's organization which in reality was a Communist front comprised of Communist and non-Communist Negro women. Friction was created when the non-Communist members sincerely sought to further the cause of civil rights and became difficult for the Communist Party to control. When the Communists determined that they could no longer manipulate the non-Communists members, they broke up the organization. As Mrs. Brown explained:

You see, the Negro women were truly trying to fight for civil rights. And the Communists only had civil rights for propaganda.

Thus Mrs. Brown illustrated for all to see what students of Communist philosophy learn early: Communist philosophy commands Communists to avoid reforming non-Communist society. Karl Marx

declared in an address to the central committee of the Communist League in March 1850:

For us the issue cannot be the alteration of private property but only its annihilation . . . not the improvement of existing society but the foundation of a new one.

Stalin, in discussing the foundations of Leninism, said:

To a revolutionary . . . the main thing is revolutionary work and not reforms; to him reforms . . . are naturally transformed into instruments for disintegrating this regime, into instruments for strengthening the revolution, into a base for the further development of the revolutionary movement.

The revolutionary will accept a reform in order to use it as an aid in combining legal work with illegal work. . . .

So important in Communist deception of the American Negro is the Communist doctrine of reforms that a further word of elaboration on this principle was offered by Counsel Alfred Nittle in his questioning of Mrs. Brown:

It is well known that any genuine effort to reform society, whether through advocacy of civil rights or otherwise, is a deviation from Communist directives; and this was again made clear in the 81 Communist Party Manifesto issued at Moscow recently, which in effect declared "reformism" to be heresy. If you sincerely make an effort peaceably to reform society and to promote reforms, you would be disciplined or expelled from the Communist Party for such deviation from policy. Communists use the reform idea to advance "class struggle," to agitate and disintegrate non-Communist society.

This explains what you have so well brought to the attention of the Committee, that the reform idea advocated by a Communist is really the sugar by which he draws the non-Communists to the poison which will prostrate non-Communist society.

In the 1940's and 1950's Miss Lola Belle Holmes, a Negro resident of Chicago, had been active in the Progressive Party and had come in contact with Communists in the area. In August of 1957 Miss Holmes was requested by the FBI to join the Communist Party as an undercover operative. She consented and remained a member of the party until January 24, 1963, when she testified for the U.S. Government before the Subversive Activities Control Board against Claude M. Lightfoot, who was chairman of the Communist Party of Illinois. During her stay in the party Miss Holmes was a member of the Negro Commission of the Communist Party of the State of Illinois and served on the national Negro Commission of the Communist Party of the United States. Because of the importance of the offices she held, Miss Holmes learned first hand the duplicity of the Communist Party in proclaiming its concern for the Negroes of the United States. In testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities relating to the Communist Party's attitude toward the success of the civil rights movement, Miss Holmes stated:

They are not concerned with the success of the civil rights movement. They wish oppression and depression of the Negro people to continue so they can have something to drive on, to work on. The Communist Party cannot be successful without oppression and depression.

Thus the record shows that it has been the policy of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, through its hearings and reports, to make public the nature of the threat that stalks the American Negro in his quest for a better life. The House Committee on Un-American Activities has tried to inform our Negro citizens, through the mouths of fellow Negro citizens, of the treachery of Communists the world over—a fact that valiant Negro American soldiers are learning today in Vietnam at the risk of their very lives.

Lucius Armstrong, for many years a Negro member of the Communist Party in Chicago, reentered the Communist Party at the request of the FBI in 1953 and continued in the party as an undercover agent until 1963. When he appeared before the committee in connection with Communist activities in the Chicago, Ill., area, Mr. Armstrong was asked what the Communist Party was trying to do in the United States. Perhaps as briefly and poignantly as it could be stated, Mr. Armstrong warned:

The Communist Party is trying to fulfill an objective aim of basic communism that is world domination, and to me a godless concept of humanity.

THE POLL THAT NEVER WAS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith a most interesting and informative speech delivered by our distinguished minority leader, Congressman FORD. I would hope that we, the membership, will find time to read his factual statement:

THE POLL THAT NEVER WAS

(Excerpt from a talk by Representative GERARD R. FORD, Republican, Michigan, minority leader of the House of Representatives, to the Washington Professional Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, Professional Journalism Society, September 20, 1966)

In the past few days there have been quite a few polls published that look encouraging to Republicans. In Sunday's (Sept. 18) Washington Post, for example, Dr. Gallup reports: "Johnson's Popularity Drops Further, Now at 48%" and just above it: "Democrats Losing Ground Rapidly As Elections Approach," according to Lou Harris. Mr. Harris finds that nationally, including the once Solid South, voters divide 52 to 48 percent in favor of Democratic candidates for Congress, which is a gain for Republicans of three percentage points over a month ago and of five percentage points since the start of this session of Congress. So I think we have had some success in getting our message to the people, even though we are outnumbered more than two-to-one, and I think there is a real chance of restoring two-party government in Washington this November.

I know you came here to hear partisan opinions and predictions about this year's election from Sen. MORTON and myself, and I will be glad to oblige you in the question period, to which I propose to yield most of my time. I also have the hunch you don't

want to hear any standard campaign speech any more than I feel like giving one in this congenial setting. So I would like to discuss with you just briefly—and I don't know whether this is a question of journalism, history or political science—what seems to me to be a very intriguing story. It's a story that hasn't been written yet, and it might be called the mystery of "The Poll That Never Was."

This should be of particular interest to Sigma Delta Chi because it involves some of your members and a cause in which you have been in the vanguard: the Freedom of Information bill which we enacted at this session. It should also be of interest because we all know who is the chief poll-watcher in this town, and how he often pulls polls of his own out of his coat pocket to counter unflattering polls produced by published surveys.

Most of you will remember the big rhubarb about polls during the 1960 Presidential campaign. But to refresh your memory, let me read from an unbiased source—Ted Sorenson—in his book, "Kennedy."

"One major issue in the debates, which related to Kennedy's entire campaign and which worked to his advantage, was that of American prestige abroad. The decline in that prestige, as evidenced by a variety of riots and adverse reactions in foreign capitals, fit well into Kennedy's major themes. Nixon retorted that our prestige was at an all-time high. Upon learning that the administration had refused to release to the Congress certain USIA overseas surveys on this subject, Kennedy called upon Nixon to show his influence and answer Kennedy's charges by obtaining their release. Nixon said the polls supported his contentions—but the polls remained secret."

"In October Mike Feldman in Washington was told he could obtain copies of the polls from a source outside the USIA. He telephoned me about his acquisition, and I ask him to forward them to me at our next overnight stop. The polls strongly backed the Senator's position and made Nixon's claims about them look like deliberate misinformation. To avoid charges that he improperly obtained classified material, Kennedy turned the polls over to the New York Times, which immediately printed them without mention of how they had been acquired, and the Senator was then free to quote them as official proof of our plummeting prestige. An Eisenhower aide promptly asked USIA Director George Allen to issue a statement saying his polls showed American prestige at a record high, but Allen refused, and the issue continued to help Kennedy."

When Senator Kennedy became President Kennedy, however, the press insisted he release the official foreign opinion polls that he had severely criticized President Eisenhower for withholding. He did so, on the day of his first State of the Union message. Needless to say, they had been so thoroughly leaked they got very little attention, but precedent had been set.

Following the Bay of Pigs fiasco, questions were raised about U.S. prestige and the press demanded the official polls. Refused at USIA, they carried the battle to the Moss subcommittee—which had been most active in battling Executive Branch secrecy during the Eisenhower years, and a long argument ensued. This was resolved in February, 1963, by an agreement between Congressman Moss and Ed Murrow, then Director of USIA, to declassify these confidential government polls after they had mellowed for two years. A batch of two-year-old polls were then released, but they covered only the first month of the Kennedy Administration. Later, when President Kennedy's prestige abroad scared following the Cuban missile crisis in the 1962 Congressional campaign, this age-dated agreement stood in the way of making the official polls public. So, they were again leaked to the New York Times.

However, the Moss-Murrow agreement still stands, officially, and has been reaffirmed by every USIA Director since. Carl Rowan, one of your S.D.X. award winners, who tried to do an honest job when LBJ gave him this difficult assignment, came to Congress asking more funds for such polls, and testified in March, 1964:

"The great advance in 1963 was the successful completion of the First World Survey of public opinion. A similar but more comprehensive survey is under way this year."

Mr. Rowan asked, and got, additional appropriations for the Third World Survey, which was to be taken during calendar 1965, and a Fourth World Survey scheduled for calendar 1966, that is, this year. Under the Moss-Murrow formula, these would have been declassified and made available to the press and public in mid-1967 and mid-1968.

Meanwhile, however, USIA got a new director, Leonard Marks, who is, I understand, a member of this chapter of S.D.X. as well as being a very able lawyer. The First and Second World Surveys, which covered only the first few months of Mr. Johnson's Presidency after President Kennedy's assassination, were duly declassified in 1965 and 1966. I have examined them and, in sum, they show American prestige on a graphic curve going upward after the Cuban Missile Crisis and off the edge of the page into 1964. There they stop. The Third World Survey, taken in 1964, is not supposed to be released until next year, after the November elections, and it would be the first to give any valid reading on what public opinion abroad—particularly among our key NATO allies—thinks about President Johnson's leadership. As of now, there is no official measurement of American prestige under LBJ to be compared with the high and low points of the Kennedy and Eisenhower Presidencies.

Now here I am going to speculate a little. The Administration has that Third World Survey, and I understand others, which it has not released nor even "leaked." As a matter of practical politics, it must not show a very favorable comparison with the Kennedy surveys—and one may sympathize with the President for having enough trouble in domestic popularity polls with the Kennedys.

But what about the Fourth World Survey? This one would be due for public inspection in 1968, and President Johnson surely has that year ringed on his calendar. Well, that is the poll which I referred to earlier as "The Poll That Never Was." Here again I am speculating, but I am sure Mr. Marks gives good counsel to his client, and his boss, and that having seen the findings of the still-secret Third World Survey, the Administration decided to call the whole thing off. I don't believe there will ever be a Fourth World Survey of Foreign Opinion of the United States, taken during the escalation year of 1966 and due for public consumption in the Presidential election year of 1968. I imagine Mr. Johnson has read Ted Sorenson's book, too.

Still, I think we ought to know where we stand in our role as leader of the free world. I think there is abundant evidence, in every day's news, that U.S. prestige has eroded dangerously, particularly in Western Europe. President Johnson has been unable to get any of our Western Allies to help us fight the war against Communist aggression in Vietnam. In fact, he has not even been able to get them to stop helping the enemy. Perhaps we cannot fairly blame LBJ for his difficulties with Gen. DeGaulle; but what about the others who responded, in token at least, during the Korean conflict?

I believe the American people share my feeling that President Johnson, in his preoccupation with the Vietnam War and the Great Society, has neglected our important role as leader of the Free World.

In a nationwide sampling taken last June by the Independent Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, New Jersey, for the Republican National Committee, potential voters were asked to rate President Johnson's performance on a variety of issues, among them "improving U.S. prestige throughout the world." The results show a steady decline in the confidence of his countrymen.

[In percent]

July 1964:	
Very good, fairly good.....	49
Not so good, poor.....	31
No opinion.....	20
August 1965:	
Very good, fairly good.....	45
Not so good, poor.....	34
No opinion.....	21
June 1966:	
Very good, fairly good.....	38
Not so good, poor.....	48
No opinion.....	14

Asked "Does the U.S. have more or fewer reliable friends around the world now than before Johnson became President?" the verdict was even more damaging:

[In percent]

More friends.....	9
Fewer friends.....	46
About the same.....	31
No opinion.....	14

There are, so I am told, official surveys in the hands of the Administration which will confirm the alarming fact that U.S. prestige has been plummeting abroad due to the indecision, incredibility and inattention of the Johnson Presidency. As an American, I do not rejoice in this. But I think we should have the facts and get on with the task of repairing the damage.

I hope that the curiosity of the Washington press on this important issue will be as intense and impartial as it was in 1960 and 1962. Although I'm aware that the new Freedom of Information Law does not take effect until after the November elections, this may be a good test of its spirit. Why should the Third World Survey of public opinion about U.S. aims during the Johnson Administration remain secret while the ups and downs of the Eisenhower and Kennedy Administrations have been spread upon the public record? What is there to hide?

UNITED STATES-JAPANESE PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLOREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution authorizing the participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Japan. The suggestion for such an interparliamentary exchange was made to me by the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Japanese Diet, the Honorable Naka Funada, when I visited Japan almost a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, the emergence of Japan as a great economic nation, and as a moderating influence in the world and particularly in Asia, suggests that stronger ties between the Members of the Congress and our counterparts in the Japanese Diet would be most useful.

The importance of continuing close relations between our Nation and the Japanese, with a delineation of the various areas that require our earnest attention, has been described recently by our former Ambassador to Japan, the Honorable Edwin O. Reischauer, and by persons prominent in the public and private life of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as a delegate to the various Interparliamentary Union Conferences, I have had occasion to witness firsthand the benefits that can flow from exchanges of views between the Members of our Congress and parliamentary representatives of other nations. If these exchanges are increased, improved understanding and mutual respect would inevitably follow.

It is my hope that this measure will be considered favorably by the appropriate committee and thereafter receive the overwhelming support of the House.

LONG-TERM PLANS FOR LATIN AMERICA

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, last year I was in Cuernavaca, Mexico, attending the "Encuentros Siglo XX" Conference which brought together intellectual, political, academic, business, and journalistic leaders of the Americas for a discussion of the long-term plans of Latin America.

On a Sunday we got the news that President Johnson was sending American troops to the Dominican Republic. Jack Vaughn, the then Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, hurriedly left the conference to return to Washington. Even in that atmosphere, the general reaction seemed to be, "Let's wait and see."

I mention this today because it has come to my attention that the last of the American troops left the Dominican Republic this week. I have had a special interest in this problem because twice I have been invited as a private citizen by the Organization of American States to be an observer of the last two Dominican presidential elections.

In December 1962, I had a chance to see the good people of a country that had known 30 years of cruel dictatorship vote for their own choice for President. In an exemplary election, Juan Bosch was elected President. My feelings were that the Dominican people were deserving of good government and good leadership. Unfortunately, a country that has been denied the practice of self-government for 30 years cannot that easily establish its democratic institutions and Juan Bosch was soon forced out and the Dominican people lost their capacity to govern themselves.

One unfortunate development followed another and finally the President found himself in a position to make the difficult decision that led to sending the Ameri-

can troops to the Dominican Republic. These troops were later joined by troops from other Latin American countries with a Brazilian General in charge of what was then an Organization of American States group. Then, through the cooperation of the Organization of American States, the long road back to the democratic process was started. Thanks to the devotion of many, including our gifted Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and the interim President of the Dominican Republic, Hector Garcia-Godoy, these efforts were climaxed with a new election this year. Again, Juan Bosch was a candidate for the Presidency and, again, it was my pleasure to be an observer for the OAS. This time, the victor was Joaquin Balaguer. Once again the election took place without incident and now the last of the American troops are gone.

History will judge the wisdom of President Johnson's actions, but, as of now, the prospects are encouraging. The recent history of the Dominican Republic is a dramatic example of the difficulties that exist in the establishing of democratic governments in countries without a tradition of self-government.

I pray that we Americans someday may be judged to have helped the good people of the Dominican Republic in their establishment of a stable democratic government, and that we may have the capacity to help others around the world in their establishment of governments which respect the individual and give him a freedom which is so crucial to a life of dignity.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE CARL FRY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Tennesseans were saddened Friday, September 16, at the death of Mr. Carl Fry. Mr. Fry, who had worked for the Federal Government since 1934, was known in Washington and in Tennessee as an able and dedicated public servant and as a man who always put the interest of others before that of his own.

Mr. Fry was a friend and close associate of the late Senator Estes Kefauver. He was a friend to me and I held that friendship with pride.

In the passing of Carl Fry we have lost a loyal and valued public servant; we have lost a loyal and valued party leader and I and all the people have lost a friend.

The following editorial appeared in the September 17 edition of the Nashville Tennessean of September 17, and I include it in the body of the RECORD at this point:

MR. CARL FRY, PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. Carl Fry of Donelson, well-known Tennessee political leader and long an official in

the federal government, is dead of a heart attack at age 61.

Mr. Fry was state executive director of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Commission. He began his career with the U.S. Department of Agriculture in 1934 and served in several positions in that department.

He had served as state chairman and director of the Production and Marketing Administration and as a director of the Commodity Credit Corp.

Mr. Fry was well known throughout the state and was highly popular with farmers of Tennessee. His popularity propelled him into the political limelight in 1962, when he announced for the governor's race and later withdrew. He was a man of high ideals and progressive views.

He was a close friend and associate of the late Sen. Estes Kefauver and managed the Senator's last campaign in 1960.

Mr. Fry was an able and dedicated public servant and a loyal and valued member of the Democratic Party. He will be greatly missed by his many friends and remembered with affection and esteem by those who knew him.

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT TAKES TO MAKE IT WORK

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Fred Cloud, associate editor, editorial division, board of education, the Methodist, has written a very thought provoking article for the October edition of *Class Mate* magazine entitled "Democracy: What It Takes To Make It Work".

In these times of unrest it seems to me that Reverend Cloud's words should give us pause for reflection.

Under permission granted, I include Reverend Cloud's article in the body of the RECORD at this point:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT TAKES TO MAKE IT WORK

(By Fred Cloud)

Bafflement: the state in which both youth and adults often find themselves as they contemplate the fast moving and complex flow of events abroad, as in Vietnam, and at home.

Hardly any problems have simple answers anymore. Specialized knowledge seems called for if a person is to make an intelligent decision about what our nation should do in Saigon—or in Watts. Faced by such a world, one is perplexed and tempted to fall into either futility or rebellion. Many do.

But America's freedom was won at too great a price, and our democracy is too precious a heritage to surrender out of despair. A bit of stock-taking might help. What is democracy? What does it take to make it work?

The starting place is the individual. You, for example. Not masses of humanity, but an individual human being, created by God. A few years ago, the President's Commission on National Goals stated that America's paramount goal "is to guard the rights of the individual, to ensure his development, and to enlarge his opportunity."¹

This is a clear echo of two sentences drafted by Thomas Jefferson nearly two centuries earlier and adopted by the Continental Congress on July 4, 1776: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying the foundation on such principles and organizing its power in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

Feel less like a little cog in a big machine? You should; for this passage from the Declaration of Independence is still basic to America's form of government. And the Bill of Rights spells out more explicitly the rights of citizens in our democracy: freedom of religion and speech, freedom of the press, the right of assembly, freedom from unreasonable search or seizure, right to due process of law and to trial by jury.

INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE

Millions of persons living under oppressive governments in 1966 would give all that they own—indeed, "would give their right arm"—to enjoy such freedoms!

"The status of the individual must remain our primary concern. All our institutions—political, social, and economic—must further enhance the dignity of the citizen, promote the maximum development of his capabilities, stimulate their responsible exercise, and widen the range and effectiveness of opportunities for individual choice."²

All this suggests that democracy is a do-it-yourself enterprise. It calls for individual initiative. This means more than the grudging assumption of responsibilities to match our rights; it means the will to work at perfecting a form of government that—because it is composed of fallible human beings—is imperfect. It means extending rights enjoyed by some to all citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Individual initiative in making democracy work will lead persons to avoid "letting George do it." Freedom is preserved as it is exercised. The freedom to vote is an empty concept if citizens do not register and cast their ballot. Democracy is not preserved and extended, just as ball games are not won, by those who simply "talk a good game."

Clinton Rossiter suggests that democracy, which requires men to think for themselves, is first of all a process—a way of making decisions and managing affairs of government at all levels. "The democratic process has been a method of arriving openly, through discussion and compromise, at decisions in keeping with the reasonable wishes of the majority, and then of pursuing these decisions with the fullest respect for the legitimate rights of the minority."³

Majority rule with respect for minority rights—that's the kind of balance that our three-branch form of government (legislative, executive, judicial) strives for. The years since World War II, and especially since 1954, have seen dramatic examples of re-ordering of our common life in such areas as civil rights to work toward that goal. How can such a difficult and delicate balance be achieved? I think the inscription above the columns of the Supreme Court Building in Washington points the way: "Equal Justice Under Law."

EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW

Equality before the law means, for one thing, that we are a government of law

rather than of force. Ideally, the poor have just as many rights, just as much protection, as the rich. In practice, of course, this is not always so. But legislation of the sixties points to our common commitment as a nation to the proposition that neither race nor economic station in life shall deprive persons of the opportunity to fulfill their potentialities and to enjoy the blessings of life in a free society.

The democratic process demands freedom of expression and free elections. For the individual, this means the responsibility of making up his mind on matters of public policy and actively participating in the choice of political leaders. We cannot escape personal involvement.

To speak in terms of "we" is to recognize not only the rights and responsibilities of the individual citizen but also our mutual dependence. Mobility since World War II has scrambled our population so effectively that old-fashioned regionalism is largely gone; and the former neat divisions between agricultural areas and industrial areas of America has been largely erased, also. The solution of such vast problems as urban renewal, the overcoming of racial discrimination, and the elimination of grinding poverty from our nation calls for cooperation by all levels of government and by citizens from all levels of society.

CONSTITUTIONALISM

We Americans are very fortunate indeed to have a base for our cooperation in addition to the good will that we are able to muster: we might call it constitutionalism. Clinton Rossiter affirms that "Americans have always believed stoutly that, while a government can be constitutional without being democratic, it cannot be democratic without being constitutional."⁴

"Constitutionalism" is a kind of respect for the rules, an acceptance of our system of checks and balances built into the Constitution of the United States by the Founding Fathers. This healthy respect for a written statement of "first principles" has enabled our nation to maintain a democratic form of government in times of great political, social, economic, and military turbulence. It has challenged us to unfold and realize the dream of the framers of the Constitution in dimensions that they could not have imagined, and yet which are in keeping with the spirit of the original Constitution. It places a needed limitation on the power of our rulers and makes them responsible for their decisions; and it insures that we shall have government in the United States by the consent of the governed.

We should not forget that the dream of freedom that motivated the Founding Fathers had a solid religious base. Neither human cleverness nor an ironclad Constitution was the basis of their hope for freedom. As Thomas Jefferson wrote, in concluding the Declaration of Independence: "For the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor." There is a reference to the vertical and horizontal dimensions in life: man-to-God in faith, man-to-man in mutual trust and integrity. Nothing that has happened in the nearly two hundred years since the words were penned has made either dimension less pertinent for persons who are concerned to make democracy work.

Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Cloud is not the only member of the Cloud family adept at expressing cogent thought through the printed word. His 16-year-old daughter, Karen Cloud, just this week was chosen by the Nashville Tennessean for publication of her views on

¹ *Goals for Americans* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), page 1.

² *Ibid.*, page 3.

³ *Ibid.*, page 61.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, page 62.

the question: "How Late Should Dates for Teen-agers Last?"

It seems to me if we of this generation paid more attention to the intelligent views of the younger generation and gave that generation more of an opportunity to express themselves our own understanding of their problems and our problems might be considerably enlightened.

SETTLEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO, AND THE WESTERN ELECTRIC CO.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body must have shared my thankfulness 2 weeks ago when we learned that a strike had been averted in an extremely vital sector of our Nation's communications industry.

Settlement was reached between the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, and the Western Electric Co. installation unit of the Bell System after negotiations had been in progress since June 28.

The Western Electric workers have yet to ratify this settlement and it may be another week or so before their decision is known. The installers are highly mobile, as their jobs require, and must be polled by mail.

I underline the national significance to this settlement between the Communications Workers and the Western Electric Co. because it is of special importance to a vastly greater number of workers than the 23,000 actually included in the installation unit settlement.

The settlement reflects great credit on all concerned. The company has gone far in meeting the needs of its employees, not only in the area of wages but in substantial improvements in insurance programs, vacations, pension and other matters.

This settlement similarly redounds to the credit of the Communications Workers Union and its president, Joseph A. Beirne. Mr. Beirne is well known to many, if not most of the Members of this body, as a union leader who has consistently sought to serve at one and the same time the members of his organization and the general public as well.

There is another facet to this settlement which this body would be well advised not to overlook. It is that genuine collective bargaining works when all the parties involved seriously want it to work. At one point in these bargaining talks there was a highly explosive potential. Negotiations began on June 28. When no accord was reached, the members of the unit involved voted by a 7-to-1 majority to strike if necessary to win a new contract. Yet, from that date forward—in a genuine effort to avert any

walkout—they worked on a day-to-day basis while their leaders engaged in a sincere, serious effort to get a reasonable new contract with the company.

Both labor and management are to be commended for their determination to reach a settlement through the collective bargaining procedure and for their success in reaching an agreement without a strike.

AUTO SAFETY LAWS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the 1966 Auto Safety Act has been described as landmark legislation by the Nashville Tennessean.

In an editorial appraisal, the Nashville newspaper notes that the measure was passed at an appropriate time—prior to the Labor Day weekend and its long record of highway fatalities.

The newspaper also welcomes the companion measure dealing with auto inspection, driver education, traffic control, and highway design.

While declaring these laws should go a long way toward solving the problem of highway safety, the Tennessean appropriately comments that, to be fully effective, they will require the cooperation of the man behind the wheel.

I include this editorial in the Record at this point:

NEW AUTO SAFETY LAWS PUT NATION ON RIGHT PATH

Congress has sent to President Johnson a landmark bill requiring federal safety standards for new automobiles starting with 1968 models and for used cars within two years.

The law comes at an appropriate time—on the Labor Day weekend—which usually means a new record in death on the highways. Although the law will have no effect on this weekend, it is hoped the nation's motorists will get into the spirit of this long-needed legislation and celebrate their Labor Day weekend by employing their own safety standards in driving.

The need for the legislation and for the inclination on the part of the driving public to use the safety devices available is demonstrated by a recent report by the State Safety Department.

The department's records show that of 1,077 people killed in traffic accidents in 1965, only nine had seat belts fastened at the time. For the first six months of this year, 518 persons were killed and only three had safety belts fastened.

The implication is that many persons are alive today because they had their seat belts fastened and undoubtedly many are dead because they did not bother to fasten seat belts that were available to them.

The new legislation just approved by Congress requires the secretary of commerce to issue federal safety standards by Jan. 31, 1967, to take effect for 1968 model cars, buses and trucks. The devices to be required have not been fully decided upon, but they are almost certain to include head rests, dual braking systems, telescopic steering wheels, shoulder harness anchorages and additional interior padding.

Additional legislation establishes a comprehensive state-city program to halt the rise in highway deaths. It will include funds—mostly to states—for auto inspection programs, driver education and testing, traffic control and improved highway design and maintenance.

The legislation is a milestone in the nation's efforts to do something about the disgraceful rise in traffic fatalities year after year.

These laws have long been needed and they should go a long way in solving the problem of highway safety. But for full effectiveness they will require the cooperation of the American people. No law can take the place of safe driving—and no safety device can save a life if it is not being used when an accident occurs.

AUTHORIZING THE ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF SEAGRANT COLLEGES AND PROGRAMS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has taken the first modest step toward fulfilling the vast untapped potential of this country's marine resources, which include largely unused plant and animal life as well as mineral wealth. By voting establishment of a program of aid to sea-grant colleges, we have helped all citizens of this country, no matter where they reside.

It is only natural to think that such a program will benefit only those States and institutions along our three great coasts and along the Great Lakes, but this, of course, is not so.

The Morrill Act of 1862, commonly called the Land-Grant College Act, has probably contributed more to the development of agriculture in this country than any other single piece of legislation. But it is naive to assert that only our Midwestern States—those usually thought of as the Farm Belt—have been the recipients of this act. Certainly the development and encouragement of agriculture has been a major factor in the sharp rise of our national economy during the last century.

I believe that establishment of sea-grant colleges will have similar, far-reaching effects, Mr. Speaker. By limiting the percentage of total funds that could go to one State, we have assured that all States and institutions will have an equal chance to participate. There are many fine institutions and firms, in Iowa, such as the Hydra-Space Co. in Cedar Rapids, as well as our coastal States, capable of developing the skilled manpower and facilities and equipment needed to use these marine resources.

The National Science Foundation, I am sure, will provide the kind of capable leadership and administration that this program needs to get started properly. We have acted wisely, I believe, in launching this program with a 2-year

authorization, providing that the Congress will review its development and potential again after that period. This is the way to insure effective and efficient implementation of such a potentially beneficial effort as the one we have voted to commence.

MARIE MAGUIRE: OUR GREATEST PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the performance of any administrator is at best difficult to evaluate, especially without the benefit of some historical perspective. But those persons seriously concerned with housing and urban development would have no difficulty in placing Marie Maguire's name at the top of the list of the most effective and successful public officials in this field. Since her appointment as Public Housing Commissioner in 1961, Mrs. Maguire has demonstrated, in addition to the ability and knowledge expected of high Government officials, that most rare and valuable quality: courage.

Courage in the field of public housing is not an easy quality to display. It means struggling with the problems of the poor, a group that has few, if any, political champions. It means opposing racism, stark and subtle, and other irrational prejudices with the attendant irrational patterns of behavior. It means fighting backwardness and educating the educable on the local and the national levels.

Only one aspect of the battle for better public housing has involved the question of good design. It is a measure of Marie Maguire's success as Public Housing Administrator that she was able to bring enlightenment into this most difficult area. She has thereby infused new life not only into public housing, but into private housing as well.

Last Tuesday, at the Urban America Inc., National Conference, the Department of Housing and Urban Development presented awards for excellence of design of buildings constructed under Federal programs administered by the Department.

There were 350 submissions from all parts of the country and the awardees were chosen by a jury of five nationally prominent architects, planners, and landscape architects, headed by David A. Wallace, partner in Wallace-McHarg, Roberts & Todd, and professor of city planning in the Department of City Planning, Graduate School of Fine Arts, University of Pennsylvania.

Three of the seven honor awards given were for public housing projects. When Mr. Wallace, in his capacity as chairman of the jury, addressed the conference on the overall quality of the entries, he in-

cluded in his remarks the following statement:

The most remarkable change in the design level occurred in the field of Public Housing. It is obvious that many local housing authorities have made a great leap forward from the early mechanistic standards of the Public Housing Administration to the realization that they are building significant parts of everybody's city. Many projects have begun to speak to a truly human design. Will the real Marie McGuire please stand up.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Wolf Von Eckhardt concerning these awards, from the Washington Post, September 14, 1966:

ARENA STAGE CITED FOR GOOD DESIGN (By Wolf Von Eckhardt)

Washington's Arena Stage has received one of seven honor awards for excellence of design of buildings constructed under Federal programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The awards were made by HUD Secretary Robert C. Weaver during yesterday's final session of the two-day Urban America conference at the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

Weaver pointed out that three of HUD's seven awards are for public housing projects. Good design, he said, "is equally important in projects for all income levels."

This view is not always shared in Congress. The General Accounting Office has recently criticized balconies and other efforts to make public housing liveable and attractive as unwarranted "extravagance."

Despite criticism and congressional restrictions, however, the architecture of Federally sponsored low-cost projects has remarkably improved, according to most critics, since President Kennedy appointed design-conscious Marie C. McGuire as Public Housing Commissioner.

IN RENEWAL AREAS

Arena Stage, like the other three buildings that received awards, is in an urban renewal area. It was designed by Harry Weese & Associates, the Chicago architects who will design Washington's subway.

The jury of five architects, planners and landscape architects called Arena Stage "outstanding in plan and external architectural quality."

The awards, Weaver said, are part of an effort to "infuse all the programs of HUD with an enthusiasm for design excellence." The effort is directed by George Rockrise, San Francisco architect and Weaver's special consultant.

Rockrise is organizing design review committees in each of HUD's seven regional offices. As HUD's new staff organization emerges, he hopes that more architects and other design professionals will be employed or consulted.

SEES HEARTENING QUALITY

Notably absent from yesterday's awards were individual homes and old structures that have been rehabilitated. Rehabilitation is now an important part of HUD's efforts.

Most of the 350 submissions from all parts of the country showed a "heartening design quality," according to David A. Wallace, a Philadelphia architect and chairman of the awards jury.

"But none of them, including the seven winners, really create a good environment with a sense of place," he said.

In addition to Arena Stage, HUD awards were received by the new pedestrian mall in the Ritz Houses public housing project in New York, Society Hill Towers in Philadelphia; the Common, a private housing project

in Chicago; Ridgeway College dormitories in Bellingham, Wash.; East Barnard public housing in West Chester, Pa., and Crawford Manor, a housing project for the elderly in New Haven, Conn.

A REVIEW OF THE ACTIVITIES OF CONGRESS DURING 1965 AND 1966

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, these closing days of the session are an appropriate time to review the activities of Congress during the past 2 years. I will do so now, Mr. Speaker, with the intention of reprinting the report at my expense and mailing it to the constituents I am privileged to represent.

The 1st session of the 89th Congress will rank as one of the most productive in history, with new departures in social security, education, agriculture, and civil rights. The second session, while striking into some new ground, has been concerned primarily with updating and refining basic legislation which underpins major Federal programs.

The legislation of most direct importance to my congressional district in western North Dakota was the 4-year farm bill, containing the principle, for the first time, that farmers are entitled to full parity. Before this session ends, another agricultural landmark will be reached, with passage of an expanded food-for-peace and freedom program, opening new production opportunities for farmers, as the Nation accepts additional responsibilities for feeding hungry people in foreign nations. Serving on the House Agriculture Committee, I welcomed the opportunity to work at close range on these measures.

This progress in agricultural policy is heartening, but we still have a way to go in overcoming the lag separating the farmer from other more prosperous segments of the economy. In pursuit of this objective, I introduced H.R. 15971 to assure wheat growers more adequate compensation on export production—a 25-cent wheat certificate, to be specific. As another means of protecting the market price for wheat, I introduced H.R. 11976, to increase the minimum resale price on Government-held stocks.

Another legislative achievement of vital importance to the State of North Dakota was the Garrison diversion authorization. This project, utilizing Missouri River water, will help build new industry, strengthen, diversify, and stabilize agriculture, provide a water supply for 14 towns and cities, and increase waterfowl production and recreational opportunities.

We took a step forward in strengthening the tourist industry in North Dakota by enacting my bill, H.R. 3957, to establish the 19th century fur-trading post of Fort Union in Williams County, N. Dak., as a national historic site, expected to at-

tract 75,000 to 100,000 visitors annually. Other achievements of particular interest to North Dakotans include legislation to assist rural communities to construct water and sewage systems and a measure designed to relieve the boxcar shortage. These and other measures, either already signed into law, passed by the House or nearing final approval, are included in the following summary:

FARM

Public Law 89-237 increases the money available to production credit associations to loan to farmers who are considered good risks but cannot borrow enough for seed, and so forth, at a private bank.

Public Law 89-240 established new matching grant program for rural communities to construct water and sewage systems; also increases loan funds for Farmers Home Administration. Several North Dakota communities already have received assistance.

Public Law 89-321 provides a 4-year farm bill extending and revising programs for wheat, feed grains, and wool through 1969, effective for the current crop year. The new voluntary wheat plan, stating full parity as a goal, has increased North Dakota farm income.

Public Law 89-331 extends Sugar Act through 1971, increasing domestic mainland cane and beet sugar quotas by 580,000 tons a year.

Public Law 89-430 authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to set freight car rental charges payable by railroads using cars owned by another railroad at a level that would encourage the borrowing line to purchase its own cars. This legislation is designed to alleviate the boxcar shortage.

Public Law 89-556 appropriates \$6.9 million for Agriculture Department programs, maintaining at approximately 1966 fiscal year levels, the school lunch and special milk programs, rural electric and telephone loan funds, the agricultural conservation program, agricultural research, extension activities, agricultural experiment stations, plant disease, pest control and eradication and credit programs.

H.R. 14929, nearing final approval, strengthens the food-for-peace and freedom program.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND PARKS

Public Law 89-80 provides \$11.5 million annually to States for coordinated planning of water resources development.

Public Law 89-108 authorizes the Garrison Diversion Unit as part of the Missouri River Basin plan. The bill authorized appropriations of \$207 million to be spent over several years. H.R. 17787, the public works appropriation bill for 1966, as approved by the House, contains a \$2 million item for a construction start in the current fiscal year.

Public Law 89-299 includes \$1.35 million for construction on the Bowman-Haley project in Bowman County. H.R. 17787, as approved by the House, contains another \$1.095 million to complete the project.

Public Law 89-337 increases flood-detention capacity under the Public Law 566 small watershed program from 5,000

to 12,500 acre-feet. This measure, which had the support of the North Dakota Association of Soil Conservation Districts, will make sufficient water available for municipalities, recreation, and irrigation on several North Dakota projects.

Public Law 89-458 authorizes Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site in Williams County, N. Dak.

MEDICAL AND HEALTH

Public Law 89-74 regulates production, purchase, and sale of depressant and stimulant drugs.

Public Law 89-97 provides a basic hospitalization program under social security for persons 65 and over, as well as an optional medical care insurance program at \$3 a month matched by Federal Government to cover physicians' fees and other services. Bill also contains 7 percent increase in social security cash benefits; expands Kerr-Mills program for those in need of medical care; and increases Federal assistance for dependent children, blind, and disabled.

Public Law 89-105 authorizes grants to community mental health centers for professional and technical personnel, and to train teachers, construct facilities, and perform research for handicapped and retarded children.

Public Law 89-115 is 3-year extension of a matching grant program for construction of health research facilities with an authorization of \$280 million.

Public Law 89-234 establishes a national policy and standards for the prevention of and control of water pollution and provides aid to communities to help them prevent filth from being dumped into streams. In addition, S. 2947, to increase appropriations authorizations for Federal grants to communities for construction of sewage treatment plants has passed the Senate. H.R. 16076, having a similar objective, has been reported out of the Public Works Committee.

Public Law 89-239 establishes regional medical research centers and clinics to fight heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases.

Public Law 89-290 extends programs for construction of facilities and loans to students to increase the number of physicians, dentists, osteopaths, optometrists, pharmacists, podiatrists, and nurses. Of particular importance to rural areas like North Dakota is a loan forgiveness provision for students who agree to practice later in shortage areas.

Public Law 89-333 expands assistance for vocational rehabilitation programs.

EDUCATION

Public Law 89-10 authorizes Federal aid to local school districts to be distributed on the basis of number of children from low-income families. For the first year, North Dakota was allocated \$6,177,278 under this legislation. H.R. 13161, to extend these programs, has been reported by the House Education and Labor Committee.

Public Law 89-182 supports State centers which act as an extension service to small businesses to help bring new scientific information to them. North Dakota so far as been allocated \$45,000.

Public Law 89-287 provides Federal loan insurance and interest subsidies for

students in post-high-school business, trade, technical, and other vocational education.

Public Law 89-329 provides Federal scholarships and federally guaranteed low-interest loans with interest subsidies for college students. Act also assists college libraries and increases 1966 appropriations authorization for construction of college classrooms and facilities. H.R. 14644, extending basic college facilities, has passed the House.

VETERANS

Public Law 89-137 provides an average 30-percent cost-of-living increase in subsistence allowances for disabled veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation training.

Public Law 89-138 extends for 10 years the period during which seriously disabled World War II or Korean war veterans can take training.

Public Law 89-311 increases rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities.

Public Law 89-358 provides educational benefits and other readjustment assistance for veterans who served in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955.

Public Law 89-466 liberalizes the indemnity and dependency compensation program for dependent parents and children of veterans who died from service-connected disabilities.

H.R. 16076, increasing pensions for 1.8 million veterans, widows, and dependent children, has been passed by the House.

HIGHWAYS AND AUTO SAFETY

Public Law 89-563 establishes Federal minimum safety standards for all motor vehicles.

Public Law 89-564 authorizes funds to assist States in developing programs to reduce traffic accidents.

Public Law 89-574 extends the interstate highway program. North Dakota will be allocated an estimated \$15,636,000 for the Interstate System next year and \$10,648,000 for other roads.

Public Law 89-285 assists States in improving scenic beauty along highways.

LABOR

H.R. 15119, to revise the Federal-State Unemployment Compensation System was passed by the House, later amended by the Senate. Differences remain to be resolved.

Public Law 89-212 amends the Railroad Retirement Act.

Public Law 89- broadens the Federal minimum wage and overtime pay protection and increases the nonfarm minimum wage in stages to \$1.60 an hour in February 1968.

GENERAL

Senate Joint Resolution 1 clears for State approval a constitutional amendment providing for the filling of a Vice-Presidential vacancy and specifying procedures in case of Presidential disability.

Public Law 89-44 reduces Federal excise taxes by \$4.6 billion.

Public Law 89-110 suspends literacy tests which had been used to deny Negroes the right to vote and authorizes appointment of Federal voting examiners to register Negroes in States and counties where voting activity is below specified levels.

Public Law 89-136 provides grants and loans for public works and other projects intended to redevelop low-income areas. Several counties in western North Dakota qualify for assistance.

Public Law 89-176 established a new Cabinet post for Housing and Urban Development.

Public Law 89-209 establishes a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

Public Law 89-253 continues the various antipoverty programs. H.R. 15111, providing for a further extension, has been reported by the House Education Committee.

Public Law 89-597 gives flexible authority to three Federal agencies to work for lower interest rates.

H.R. 15963, to create a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation, has been passed by the House.

As we enter the concluding days of the session, Congress still must act on several major appropriations bills. A dominant fact is that appropriations for defense and expenses of past wars continue to comprise about two-thirds of the budget. Funds approved by the House for foreign economic and military aid for this fiscal year are 10 percent below the amount requested by the administration; the Senate has not yet acted.

Also in this windup period, Congress is engaged in a debate on how to ease the pressure on costs created by an economy that has been growing without interruption since February 1961. To dampen this pressure, Congress, early in the session, approved, on a temporary basis, a new system of graduated withholding for income taxes and accelerated collections of corporate taxes. Recently, the administration requested a 16-month suspension of the 7-percent credit on income tax for investment in production equipment. One of the final decisions of this Congress will be whether this is a suitable way to cope with the problem.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT IN THE CIVIL RIGHTS FIELD

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the House Rules Committee has under consideration a resolution to create a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Commissioner of Education's policies and guidelines on school desegregation. The need for legislative oversight, however, exists not only over the Department of Education's policies but over the compliance and implementation of all our civil and voting rights laws.

The above-mentioned conclusions were those of a special Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Civil Rights of Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I had the privilege to serve as chairman and was ably joined

by Congressman JAMES C. CORMAN, of California, and Congressman CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, Jr., of Maryland.

The Ad Hoc Advisory Committee was established on October 13, 1965, and conducted a series of conferences, lasting 6 days. The committee met with numerous Federal officials, organizational representatives and officials from the Southern States most directly involved. Throughout the conferences, it was the opinion of all parties that an oversight committee be established within the Judiciary Committee. This, also, was the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee when it concluded its report in late January and made it available to Subcommittee No. 5 in early February of this year.

Precedent to yesterday's action by the Rules Committee in this area, concern about implementation of title VI with respect to Government entities in the South was expressed in floor debate on the 1966 civil rights bill by several Members. At that time, on August 9, I alluded to title VI and questioned whether it is administered effectively.

In a subsequent exchange of correspondence with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT], who understandably is anxious that certain complaints concerning the Department of Education and school authorities in his district be given a hearing, I indicated in a letter that "unfortunately the ad hoc subcommittee was authorized only to make preliminary investigation and report on the legislative oversight in the areas of voting and civil rights." But I also suggested that if such a committee in the judiciary is constituted, it would proceed to consider the possibility of holding hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that in light of this interest and more general concern, the Judiciary Committee ought now to move ahead forthwith to implement the recommendations of the report. The Judiciary Committee has fathered the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. If Congress decides to establish such a committee, the jurisdiction of matters related thereto should remain with the committee which has the greatest familiarity with the legislative history of all of the civil and voting rights acts. It is my feeling that oversight in matters over implementation and compliance should rest within the Judiciary Committee, rather than establish a select committee to investigate only one title of these acts.

The report of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee appears hereunder for the benefit of all Members:

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT OF VOTING AND CIVIL RIGHTS

(Mr. KASTENMEIER, together with Messrs. CORMAN and MATHIAS, submits the following report of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Civil Rights of Subcommittee No. 5, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives)

I. GENERAL STATEMENT

Chairman EMANUEL CELLER and the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5 established the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Civil Rights on October 13, 1965. Members of Subcommittee No. 5 named to the Advisory Committee were Congressman ROBERT W.

KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin, as chairman, Congressman JAMES C. CORMAN, of California, and Congressman CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, of Maryland. The Advisory Committee was charged with making a preliminary evaluation of compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the 1957, 1960 and 1964 Civil Rights Act. Other questions to be considered were the desirability of establishing an oversight subcommittee within the House Judiciary Committee, the need and propriety for the Judiciary Committee to travel to trouble spots for investigatory purposes and the need for subpoena power and additional funds for traveling.

II. SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Civil Rights held a series of executive conferences in Washington on October 26, 27, 28, and November 29, 30, and December 1, 1965. The six day-long sessions included a total of 28 conferences.

The Advisory Committee met with numerous Federal officials to discuss the responsibilities and activities of their agencies in implementing the existing voting and civil rights acts. Organizations concerned with voting and civil rights compliance provided your Committee with their views on the effectiveness of the existing laws and they also made recommendations where they felt improvement was necessary. Officials from the southern states most directly involved were provided an opportunity to present their views on whether and in what particulars they consider the civil and voting rights acts unduly burdensome to their states and whether the legislation might be improved by amendment. These officials also summarized the implementation of the laws in their states.

A list of the witnesses which were invited appears in Appendix I.

A brief description of the 1957, 1960, 1964 Civil Rights and 1965 Voting Rights Acts appears in Appendix II.

A summary of recent registration statistics is provided in Appendix III.

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Civil rights

Federal agency representatives and cabinet officers not only cooperated fully with your Committee, but in most cases welcomed the opportunity to discuss their efforts undertaken to implement the civil rights acts. In many cases the difficulties and limitations encountered were stressed. Several of the Departments such as Labor, Defense, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, have a substantial number of programs to administer and consequently a detailed analysis of each program's involvement with the civil rights acts was necessary. Certain agencies, such as the Community Relations Service, having exclusively civil rights responsibilities, had to be surveyed on a function-by-function basis. A number of agencies submitted lengthy published reports of studies and analyses they had made in connection with their own involvement in attempting to implement the laws with which we are herein concerned. The extent of the Executive Branch's involvement with these laws was, in this respect, highly impressive.

The testimony of the majority of federal agency representatives focused on efforts to implement Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Most explained in detail the mechanics that have been established to integrate Title VI in their individual programs. The experience in implementing this Title varied from agency to agency. Some agencies felt they had to accept written assurances of compliance short of full compliance in order to carry out the basic programs they were established to administer. The Office of Education, for example, submitted statistics to show that as of October 22, 1965, 95.8 percent of the school districts in 17 southern

and border states had submitted school integration plans which were found to be acceptable as evidence of compliance with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. No one seriously contended this accurately reflected actual compliance. Most other agencies acknowledged the assurances of compliance they had received were not matched by actual compliance. Some expressed the gradualism argument that it did represent some increased compliance which hopefully would ultimately lead to full compliance. Several agencies said their ability to investigate actual compliance was limited and that additional funds for such investigations would be needed.

Most speakers who dealt with the subject of equal accommodations indicated these provisions of the 1964 Act were almost universally observed along major arteries of travel throughout the South, but that facilities in rural or less populated areas in the South were rarely in full compliance.

Civil rights organizations uniformly told your Committee that the disparity between written assurances and actual compliance was indefensible. They contended it undercut respect for Congressional civil rights action. Many spokesmen pointed to other instances where the decision of the federal agency apparently held back from taking the full steps authorized by the 1964 Act and that Congress should make its views known on the various interpretations given that Act by the federal agencies.

Officials of southern states observed that the practical problems of absolute compliance made compliance in excess of current levels implausible. Some cited various practical problems in the administration of hospital, education and other state and local programs which stood in the way of immediate and complete compliance. Some indicated a continuing interest in finding ways to preserve the separate, but equal concept in administering federally-supported state programs.

Your Committee concluded that in most instances actual compliance with the civil rights laws obviously was not equal to the paper evidence submitted to and accepted by federal agencies. We further concluded that many issues are involved in the implementation of existing civil rights laws which require Congress to play a continuing role in developing and resolving them. In many cases, it is important to the fulfillment of the intent of the laws for Congress to act upon such questions as the need of the various agencies for additional funds for investigating compliance with the law as it affects their programs. In other instances, Congress has a valid interest in the quality as well as the quantity of compliance. In some cases, in the light of the speed with which events can and do move, Congress should be in a position to initiate legislative action rather than wait for a federal agency to request it. The job of pulling the strings together on all the activities and published materials of the federal agencies, itself, requires a significant effort if Congress is to obtain the full benefit of the ideas and the recommendations carried by them.

B. Voting rights

The Department of Justice, the Civil Service Commission, and the Bureau of the Census set forth a summary of the steps they have taken to date to enforce the Voting Rights Act. At the first conferences your Committee held late in October, the Department of Justice provided statistics indicating that 55,000 Negro citizens had been listed by federal examiners in 20 southern counties and that 110,000 Negroes had been registered by local registrars throughout five of the states covered by the Voting Rights Act since its enactment. Three days following our conferences, the Attorney General publicly announced he was sending examiners

to 12 other counties. Subsequently, examiners have been sent to other counties, including Jefferson County, Alabama, bringing the total counties covered to 37. Appendix III provides the latest available statistics on voter registration. In summary, it now appears that federal examiners have listed a total of 82,804 Negro citizens (prior to January 20, 1966) and that local registrars had registered a total of approximately 160,000 Negroes through the first week of January 1966. It would appear that these efforts are falling short of the expected registration rate of one million in the first year. The Department of Justice defended the relatively low number of federal examiners on the grounds that the Act is designed to call forth voluntary compliance and that such compliance by local registrars should be encouraged and sought in preference to using federal examiners. In some areas where examiners have been sent, the examiners referred registrants to the local registrar. The Justice Department cited some advantages to having as many voters as possible registered through the local registrar. The Justice Department also indicated it does not feel it has the job of encouraging registration and voting. It believes this is a role of voter education groups and to the extent that people have not come forward to register is due to the failure of such voter education programs. The Civil Service Commission detailed several legal efforts that certain southern states have used to slow registration under the Voting Rights Act. The Bureau of the Census cited the discrepancy between the direction of the 1965 Act to compile racial discrimination in voting information and the 1964 Act which forbids anyone from compelling another to disclose his race.

Voting rights was an area where representatives of civil rights organizations expressed the most profound criticism of enforcement and compliance efforts. They contended that the expected revolutionary results have not been realized and that the number of voters listed or registered under the Act has fallen far short of expectations. They fear some disillusionment with the power of Congress in view of the early primaries in many southern states which force an early deadline for effective registration. While taking note of the Justice Department position, civil rights witnesses generally believed a vastly stepped-up registration effort needs to be made by the federal government to give effect to the Voting Rights Act.

Your Committee, shortly after being appointed, had an opportunity to discuss voting rights with a group of Negro citizens from Alabama. They attributed low registration to (1) the failure to send examiners despite the proper filing of complaints, (2) physical intimidation [one of the persons, following registration activities, had been shot at], (3) economic pressures [one civil rights worker faced the loss of his farm because peanut-picking equipment could not be rented from his usual supplier], and (4) the economic infeasibility of taking a work day, and sometimes more, to go to a hostile local official to register. They expressed the fear that voter turnout would be even less in the face of such intimidation since the place of registration usually was remote from their homes while they would have to vote in their home precincts directly in the face of local white opposition. Your Committee, of course, is not in a position to evaluate these allegations. It would appear to the Committee, however, that on-site investigations would be of great value in assessing evidence of this kind as it bears on existing or prospective federal legislation.

State representatives emphasized the problem of identifying accurately the persons listed by federal examiners and suggested that federal examiners were not as careful about listing persons as they should be. They generally are placing the names of

individuals listed by examiners on the voters list but are designating them (in some cases, by placing an "F" after their names) as federally listed. At least one conferee indicated a general intention to challenge the vote of every federally-listed voter. They also indicated that the addition of many illiterate voters would affect their jury selection system since registered voters presently comprise the pool from which jurors are selected. Your Committee did not have the opportunity to evaluate first hand the effectiveness of federal examiners or the registration practices of local examiners and came to no firm conclusions as to the need to assign a greater number of examiners to the states involved or as to the need to otherwise step up registration efforts. We do conclude, however, that Congress has a real and immediate need to make such an evaluation and to make its views in this regard manifest. It is our belief that a similar need will exist with regard to the practices which are developed in subsequent stages of the procedures called for by the Voting Rights Act.

C. The need for new laws

A number of proposals have been made for new laws. The Civil Rights Commission, the President in the State of the Union Message, a number of private organizations and a number of Congressmen have proposed legislation in the area of reform in state and federal jury selection systems and personal security for Negroes and civil rights workers in the South. The number and increasing frequency of tragic racial incidents in summer, fall and early winter underscored the position of advocates of legislation in this field. In addition, Congress may soon expect to be confronted by demands for amendments strengthening the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission and for national housing legislation.

Your Committee did not inquire directly into a number of other situations throughout the country. The Watts area riot, the Chicago school desegregation situation and the racial discrimination in the North generally are certain to provide Congress and this Committee with a plethora of urgent problems.

Your Committee found a significant degree of concern for the physical well-being of civil rights workers as well as a genuine and widespread belief that the administration of justice in some formerly racially segregated areas is adversely affected by traditions of segregation. Given this apparent source of demand for further civil rights legislation and as physical and economic intimidation against civil rights workers and voters becomes more subtle, there exists, in our judgment, a need for on-site investigations leading to the consideration of further legislation.

Further, your Committee must be in a position to entertain criticism of existing law as expressed by officials of the several southern states and determine whether any unfair or unduly burdensome aspects exist and whether such can and should be removed by statutory amendment.

D. Executive reorganization

Parallel with your Committee's efforts have come plans for reorganization of civil rights activities within the Executive Departments. The reorganization includes proposals to transfer the Community Relations Service to the Justice Department and in other ways to centralize federal civil rights responsibilities in that Department.

Steps also are being taken to designate the responsible agency among several having concomitant civil rights responsibilities.

Your Committee noted the possibility of a lack of harmony between agencies while also taking note of the fact that the differences publicly alluded to between Labor and

the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity apparently have been reconciled.

In the opinion of your Committee these matters are all of great interest to Congress, but presently do not receive the consideration of a particular committee on a continuing day-to-day basis. We believe they should receive such consideration.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Your Committee urges the House Judiciary Committee to authorize and direct a subcommittee, special or existing, to exercise legislative oversight in the fields of voting and civil rights.

America is undergoing a vast and far-reaching social revolution.

It is a tribute to Congress that its enactments have begun to provide the legal avenues by which this revolution can move America to a level of racial equality, politically, economically and socially. By and large, this revolution has been a non-violent one and yet, like other revolutions, it has a sense of urgency about it, an impatience with the old ways, a desire or demand to reach the goal without delay.

These are the conditions which Congress must face if it is going to play an effective role in achieving the end we have now begun in earnest to seek. It is obvious, therefore, that the responsibility of Congress will not stop with the passage of legislation. Congress must be involved in the ways and means by which the language of the law is applied to the day-to-day experiences of men living in a social revolution.

Your Committee firmly believes Congress should be involved in an institutional way, and not merely on an individual basis as is the present practice, in the implementation of voting and civil rights acts by the federal agencies. This calls for the establishment of a special body with broad responsibility to Congress for constant liaison with federal agencies and for the investigation, analysis and interpretation of programs, studies, and reports of these agencies. Similarly, Congress is directly involved in and concerned with the distribution of voting and civil rights responsibilities within the Executive.

We further believe the Congress should also have the means to assess first-hand, through on-site investigations, the degree and extent of compliance by individuals and state and local authorities, as required by the various Acts of Congress. Such investigations would be helpful in expediting the resolution of troublesome impasses over the meaning of specific Acts of Congress. Similarly, it would provide Congress the means to assess first-hand where procedural requirements may be onerous or unworkable, where existing law needs clarifying and where further legislation may need to be considered.

Furthermore, we believe that a subcommittee must accept responsibilities solely for voting and civil rights and should provide a ready forum for complaints and grievances and for proposals and recommendations, to which concerned citizens, organizations and state and local officials could look to be sure their point of view is known, understood, and considered in and by Congress.

We must continue in earnest that which we have now begun in earnest. To this end, we make the following recommendations:

First. That a subcommittee, existing or special, within the House Judiciary Committee be authorized and directed to attend to matters involving voting and civil rights on a continuing basis.

Second. That such subcommittee be authorized to travel within the continental limits of the United States for the purpose of conducting appropriate on-site hearings and/or investigations.

Third. That adequate funds for professional staff and for other purposes be obtained for such subcommittee.

Fourth. That authority to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books or papers or other documents or vouchers by subpoena or otherwise be obtained for such subcommittee.

POSTSCRIPT

Your Committee was pleased to have several agency heads express a firm belief that the establishment of a legislative voting and civil rights oversight committee would be useful in enabling them to discharge their responsibilities. Civil rights organizations also were enthusiastic about such a proposal and no exception or objection to such a committee came out of the conferences with representatives of the southern states or from any other source. In fact, our conferences with all parties proceeded in an aura of mutual respect and all witnesses sought to be helpful and cooperative. We were greatly encouraged to believe highly valuable relationships can be developed to the mutual advantage of all concerned with the nation's most difficult and vexing domestic problem.

APPENDIX I

Those who appeared before the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Civil Rights:

Samuel Yette, Coordinator, Civil Rights Activities, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

Robert Sauer, Assistant General Counsel, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C.

Jack Beidler, Legislative Director, Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

William Pollard, Staff Representative, Department of Civil Rights, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

Honorable Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

John Doar, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Calvin Kytte, Acting Director, Community Relations Service, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Honorable LeRoy Collins, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Paul Boyajian, Equal Opportunity Program, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

Earl Thomas, Chief, Division of Compliance, Office of Survey Review, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

Richard Murphy, Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Personnel, Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

William Taylor, Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Walter Fauntroy, Washington Representative, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Washington, D.C.

Sanford Bolz, Washington Counsel, American Jewish Committee, Washington, D.C.

L. Howard Bennett, Assistant for Civil Rights, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

William Seabron, Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

John W. Macy, Chairman, Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C.

Francis Keppel, Commissioner, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Honorable Don Edwards, a Representative in Congress from the State of California; National Chairman, Americans for Democratic Action, Washington, D.C.

Joseph Rauh, Vice Chairman, Americans for Democratic Action, Washington, D.C.

Marion Barry, Director, Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, Washington, D.C.

William Higgs, Attorney, Washington Human Rights Project, Washington, D.C.

Melvin Wulf, Legal Director, American Civil Liberties Union, Washington, D.C.

A. Ross Eckler, Acting Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Marvin Caplan, Director, Washington Office, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.

Clarence Mitchell, Director, Washington Bureau, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Washington, D.C.

Honorable Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Berl I. Bernhard, Executive Director, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Washington, D.C.

Honorable Robert McLeod, Attorney General, South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

Henry L. Lake, Legal Assistant to the Governor of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

Ralph Moody, Deputy Attorney General, North Carolina, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Alex Brock, Executive Secretary, North Carolina State Board of Elections, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Washington, D.C.

Honorable Richmond Flowers, Attorney General, Alabama, Montgomery, Alabama.

James Quigley, Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Harold Fleming, Executive Vice President, Potomac Institute, Washington, D.C.

Prepared statements submitted for the record:

Honorable Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., Governor, Commonwealth of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia.

Honorable Robert Y. Button, Attorney General, Commonwealth of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia.

Honorable Joe T. Patterson, Attorney General, Mississippi, Jackson, Mississippi.

Honorable Jack P. F. Gremillion, Attorney General, Louisiana, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

The Attorneys General of Louisiana and Mississippi declined to comment on the civil rights and voting rights legislation while their states are engaged in litigation with the Department of Justice over the constitutionality of the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

Those invited to appear before the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Voting and Civil Rights but were unable to do so:

Matthew Ahmann, Executive Director, National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, Chicago, Illinois.

George Wiley, CORE, New York, New York. Jean Fairfax, American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

David Seldon, Assistant to the President, American Federation of Teachers, Chicago, Illinois.

Father John Cronin, Assistant Director, Department of Social Action, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C.

Robert Spike, Executive Director, National Council of Churches, New York, New York. Paul Anthony, Executive Director, Southern Regional Council, Atlanta, Georgia.

Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, Jackson, Mississippi.

Honorable John J. McKeithen, Governor, Louisiana, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Honorable Paul B. Johnson, Governor, Mississippi, Jackson, Mississippi.

Honorable George C. Wallace, Governor, Alabama, Montgomery, Alabama.

Honorable Carl E. Sanders, Governor, Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia.

Honorable Arthur K. Bolton, Attorney General, Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia.

APPENDIX II

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1957

H.R. 6217 was designed to protect the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States. In order to accomplish that objective, the Act provided for the establishment of a bipartisan commission to investigate asserted violations of law in the field of civil rights which involve the right to vote and to make studies and recommendations of the legal developments and policies of the federal government with respect to the equal protection of the laws under the Constitution of the United States. It also provided for an additional Assistant Attorney General, who would be in charge of a civil rights division in the Department of Justice. The Act amended existing law so as to permit the federal government to seek from the courts preventive or other necessary relief in civil rights cases. Finally, it provided further safeguards for the enforcement of the right to vote.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1960

The Act was designed to provide more effective means to enforce the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States. In furtherance of that objective, the Act strengthened the penal law with respect to the obstruction of court orders in public school desegregation cases. It made criminal flight in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution or punishment for damaging or destroying any building or other real or personal property. The Act provided for the preservation of federal election records and authorized their inspection by the Attorney General. It amended the Civil Rights Act of 1957 so as to extend the existence of the Civil Rights Commission for two years and to provide for voting referees. Finally, it enabled the federal government to provide for the education of all children of the Armed Forces when schools have been closed because of desegregation orders.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

H.R. 7152, the most far-reaching civil rights legislation since the Reconstruction Era, provided for expanded Federal powers to protect voting rights; granted authority for the federal government to sue to desegregate public accommodations, public facilities, and public schools; extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission and expanded its jurisdiction; authorized the cut-off of federal programs where they are applied in a discriminatory manner; outlawed denial of equal job opportunities in businesses and unions with 25 or more workers; provided for the gathering of voting statistics by race; authorized the federal government to intervene in any private suit alleging denial of equal protection of the laws; made reviewable in higher federal courts the action of federal district courts in remanding a civil rights case to state courts; and created a Community Relations Service to help resolve local civil rights problems.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

P.L. 89-110 authorized appointment by the Civil Service Commission of voting examiners, who would determine an individual's qualifications to vote and would require enrollment of qualified individuals by state and local officials to vote in all elections: federal, state and local and delegates to party caucuses and state political conventions; made any state or political subdivision subject to appointment of federal examiners if (1) the Attorney General determined that a literacy test or similar device was used as a qualification for voting on November 1, 1965, and (2) the Director of the Bureau of the Census determined that less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age residing in the area were registered to vote on that date or actually voted in the 1964 Presidential Elections; authorized appointment of either

private citizens or federal officials as examiners; authorized examiners to interview applicants concerning their qualifications for voting and to order appropriate state or local authorities to register all persons they found qualified to vote; suspended literacy tests or similar voter qualification devices when the Attorney General and Director of the Bureau of the Census determined that a state or political subdivision came within the scope of the Act's automatic triggering formula; stipulated that a person could not be denied the right to vote because of inability to read or write in English if he demonstrated that he had successfully completed the sixth grade in a school under the American Flag that was conducted in a language other than English; and required that new voting laws enacted by state or local governments whose voter qualification laws had been nullified under the bill be approved by the Attorney General or federal courts before they could take effect.

APPENDIX III

REGISTRATION STATISTICS

Registration statistics since enactment of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Information on voters registered by local registrars is obtained through the FBI (Local registrar information is approximation and is through first week of January):

State	Negroes registered	Whites registered
Alabama.....	34,000	25,000
Louisiana.....	49,000	15,300
Mississippi.....	43,000	12,300
South Carolina.....	20,000	3,700
Georgia.....	14,000	13,200
Total.....	160,000	69,500

Information on voters listed by federal examiners was obtained from the Civil Service Commission and is accurate covering the period through January 20, 1966—but does not include the 23 examiners which began operations in Jefferson County, Alabama, on January 24, 1966:

State	Negroes listed	Whites listed
Alabama (10 counties).....	36,770	207
South Carolina (2 counties).....	4,267	12
Mississippi (19 counties).....	29,749	37
Louisiana (5 parishes).....	12,018	1,439
Total (36 counties).....	82,804	1,695

NOTE.—In late October 1965, registration figures disclosed approximately 85,000 Negroes listed by Federal examiners and 110,000 registered by local registrars.

THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a copy of a speech made by the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House, of which I am a member, in Chicago, Ill., on September 14, 1966, before the American Public Works Association, concerning the important Interstate Highway System, as well as the grave problem of water pollution.

I am particularly proud to point out to my colleagues that a letter from the American Public Works Association, in addition to thanking the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] for a very fine speech, announces that he has been appointed an honorary member of the association. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] is 1 of 30 honored in this manner and is the first and only Member of Congress so appointed. This is such an outstanding honor that I would like to include a letter from the Vice President of the United States in which he commends the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] for this singular distinction.

The speech and letters follow:

AMERICAN PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., March 11, 1966.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman, Public Works Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FALLON: It is a real pleasure for me to officially inform you that the Board of Directors of the American Public Works Association has voted to make you an Honorary member of this Association.

This is the highest honor that the APWA can bestow upon an individual and is intended to indicate to the greatest possible extent the Associations esteem, respect and regard for persons thus honored.

You are one of only 25 persons who have been so honored by the APWA in the 73 year history of this organization. Only 11 living members hold this honor at the present time. You are the first and only Member of Congress to be specifically cited and honored by this Association.

The public announcement of your election to Honorary Membership will be made at the APWA's Annual Banquet at the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago on Wednesday evening, September 14 at the conclusion of the 1966 Public Works Congress and Equipment Show. We have invited Vice President HUMPHREY to be the guest speaker on this important occasion.

I realize that you will be running for reelection about this time and hope that this won't prevent you from making a quick trip to Chicago as you can be present to receive this honor and recognition in person.

You have certainly done an outstanding job in serving the field of public works during your many years in Congress. We shall look forward to welcoming you into the membership of this Association and hope you will be able to be with us here in Chicago on September 14.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT D. BUGHER,
Executive Director.

WASHINGTON, September 12, 1966.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: I am pleased to learn that you will be the guest speaker at the Annual Banquet of the American Public Works Association in Chicago on September 14. My schedule will not allow me to attend as I had originally planned, and regret this particularly since my old friend Hugo Erickson will be installed as President for the coming term. Hugo was City Engineer, when I was Mayor of Minneapolis.

My congratulations and best wishes to you upon your selection as an Honorary Member of the American Public Works Association. I understand that you are the first member of Congress so honored, and in my opinion, this is an honor you richly deserve.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN FALLON, APWA BANQUET, SEPTEMBER 14, 1966, CHICAGO, ILL.

It is a genuine privilege for me to be with you and to have this opportunity to meet with the fine members of the American Public Works Association.

The growth of your organization reflects the growing importance of municipal and metropolitan governments in this increasingly urbanized country of ours. Like it or not, we are becoming a Nation of city-dwellers. The complexities of city life impose very serious problems for those who are engaged in the business of administering city governments and providing such services as transportation, water supply and waste disposal.

There are many problems for which satisfactory solutions have not been found. Finding the solution—this is your great task and your great challenge. You are the architects of the future, building monuments to the accomplishments of mankind. You hold the keys to national economic welfare, public health, recreation, the preservation of natural beauty and the civil defense.

It is very impressive to me to observe APWA in action. Through your association, you are working together to solve your problems. You might sit back, as some do, and wait for some agency of the Federal government to come through with a book of answers. It is much better, in my way of thinking, to get together in a voluntary association like this one and exercise your own initiative. You are the people who are dealing with municipal problems day by day and yours are the solutions which are likely to be the most practical.

I remember the questions that arose back in 1962 when the House Subcommittee on Roads, of which I was the Chairman, was considering a provision of the 1962 Highway Act concerning urban transportation planning. The proposal, one that Congress eventually accepted, was that urban places of more than 50,000 population should be required to set up and maintain comprehensive and continuing transportation planning processes, as a prerequisite for the approval of new Federal-aid highway projects in those places.

Some of us were quite concerned about this proposal. We knew that there were many communities where this sort of planning process did not exist. We knew that many of these urban places straddled State and county lines and included several incorporated cities and towns, and that it would be difficult for many places to comply with the proposed requirement.

We recognized the importance of coordinated transportation planning, but we were concerned that the requirement might work to unnecessarily delay urgently needed highway construction projects.

The APWA performed a very valuable service by forming a joint committee with the American Road Builders' Association to make surveys and obtain data concerning the status of transportation planning processes and their organizational structure. By making this information available to public works officials, the task of developing effective urban transportation planning programs was greatly expedited.

Your research program, your educational program and the programs of your technical committees are all noteworthy contributions to progress in your field.

I must congratulate you, also, on your sponsorship of National Public Works Week, and the recognition you give annually to the Top Ten Public Works Men-of-the-Year.

I realize that an after-dinner speaker should pattern himself on the style of an after-dinner drink—short and sweet, and not too hard on the digestion. And so, in discussing with you some of the legislative

events that have concerned us in Washington this year, I should be careful not to burden you with an extensive and wearisome account.

We have, indeed, had a busy time of it. My good friend, JOHN KLUCZYNSKI, who succeeded me as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, has borne the brunt. It has been a busy Congress for highway legislation, and the end is not in sight.

Our biggest problem has been, and continues to be, that of providing the legislation necessary to assure the timely completion of the Interstate System. Congressman KLUCZYNSKI and I—and others as well—never stop talking about the urgency of linking up the 41,000-mile Interstate System. I'm sure that people get tired of listening to us. Sometimes they talk back and say, "What's the hurry? What's so magic about a completion date of 1972 or 1973? Won't 1975 do just about as well?"

The trouble, as you people well know, is that we are already overdue with the Interstate System, as far as the need for such a System is concerned. We knew back in 1944, when Congress first authorized the Interstate System, that the System was needed as the new backbone for a modernized network of highways in this country. The Interstate System was needed in 1944.

We are killing 50,000 people a year in traffic accidents. The Interstate System, on completion, will save at least 8,000 lives per year. I say this indicates an urgent need for the completion of the System.

Then too, as I hardly need to remind you, it is becoming more difficult every year, every month, to build new expressways into and through our densely populated metropolitan areas. The price of land goes steadily up. Land is needed for new office and commercial buildings, new industries, new parks and playgrounds.

A new Interstate Beltway rings my hometown in Baltimore. Its usefulness surpasses all expectations. The Beltway has created a whole new breed of expressway boosters. Nevertheless, we are having great difficulties in bringing the freeway system into the City of Baltimore. We have special problems, of course, but who doesn't? And as we delay the construction of urban freeways, the problems multiply and the costs go up.

The last official cost estimate for the Interstate System was submitted to Congress in 1965. It indicated that the total cost of the Interstate program would be \$46.8 billion—\$5.8 billion more than earlier estimates.

The Federal share of the increase was estimated to be \$5 billion.

Unfortunately, the 1965 Cost Estimate is already obsolete. It is at least \$4 billion too low.

The next official Cost Estimate is to be submitted to Congress in January, 1968. Pending the receipt of the 1968 Cost Estimate, Congress has authorized increases in the Interstate apportionments for the next two fiscal years. We know that we will have to take another hard look in 1968 and provide for further increases in the schedule of Interstate authorizations.

The Interstate apportionment to be made this year has been increased from \$3 billion to \$3 billion 400 million. The Interstate apportionment to be made next year has been increased from \$3 billion to \$3 billion 800 million. In other words we are increasing the rate of Interstate authorizations by better than 10 percent per year—a substantial increase but not sufficient to assure the completion of the Interstate System by 1972.

One major part of the problem is that the flow of revenue into the Federal Highway Trust Fund must be increased to match the contemplated increase in disbursements from the Trust Fund. In addition to further increases in Interstate authorizations, Congress must also augment the revenue sources of

the Highway Trust Fund, in order to complete the Interstate System by 1972.

It seems self-evident that the kind of increased costs that we are encountering in the Interstate program are also being encountered in the regular Federal-aid program for primary, secondary and urban highways. For this category of Federal aid, the Federal share is \$1 billion per year, matched by the States on a 50-50 basis. The 1966 Highway Act continues this regular Federal-aid program at the same level. An increase would be desirable, in view of higher construction costs and increased usage of the highways but, again, we are up against the problem of finding increased revenue for the Highway Trust Fund.

One of the big problems in planning major urban highway construction projects is that of providing for the relocation of people and businesses. It is no use saying that the provision of suitable housing is the business of the housing authorities and no concern of the highway agencies. We have come to the point when, in many urban places, highway officials must concern themselves with the problems of housing in order for highway projects to move forward. Highway plans and housing plans have to be closely coordinated. The Bureau of Public Roads has made some studies concerning joint condemnation of land by highway and housing authorities—the taking of entire city blocks in such a way that the land not needed for highway right-of-way is made available for public housing, and so that the space over and under the highway can be used for commercial structures or parking. It is an extremely complicated problem. The 1966 Highway Act provides for a study of relocation procedures by the Secretary of Commerce, with the help of the State highway departments and other agencies, with a report and recommendations to be submitted to Congress by July 1, 1967.

Another study provided for in the 1966 Highway Act is concerned with the procedures for the acquisition of right of way in advance of construction. This, too, has particular application to the problems of urban areas, where it sometimes becomes desirable to acquire title to parcels of real estate well in advance of the scheduled time for construction.

Another new law of particular interest to city officials is the Highway Safety Act. This is another piece of legislation which has occupied a great deal of the time and attention of the House Committee on Public Works. It provides for Federal grants to the States to assist in the support of State traffic safety programs, covering a wide variety of things including driver education, accident reporting, and studies leading to improvements in traffic control, highway design and highway maintenance.

The field of highway safety is one that demands the best efforts of everybody—the individual motorists, highway user and highway construction organizations, the automotive industries, the insurance companies, and all levels of government. We have been concerned about the prospect that, in strengthening the role of the Federal government, we might unwittingly cause other agencies to relax and let up—concerned that some people might say that the responsibility for traffic safety has been taken over by the Federal government.

Such is not the case, and we have been careful to write a law which encourages maximum cooperation among agencies, both public agencies and those financed by private funds.

The new law requires every State to have a State safety program. One of the conditions for an acceptable State safety program is that at least 40 percent of the Federal funds granted to a State be used by local governments for safety programs which are

consistent and coordinated with the State safety program.

Obviously, there is a big role for the cities, and a big opportunity for cities to obtain Federal assistance in the carrying out of their local safety programs.

During the last few years, the Federal government has extended its activities in another Public Works field which demands close cooperation with cities and other local governments if the program is to succeed. I refer to the area of water pollution.

I don't know of any domestic government program which is more important—more vital to our very existence—than the preservation of our clean water supply through intelligent effort to minimize pollution. The control of pollution is an important function of city governments. You need a great deal of help—help from State governments and help from the Federal government.

The subject of water pollution, certainly, is one that should continue to receive close attention from your Association.

I am impressed, as I speak to you, how the interests of the House Public Works Committee parallel the interests of the APWA. Our committee is concerned with roads and streets—fully one half of the Interstate program is concerned with expressways within urban areas, and 25 percent of the funds for the regular Federal-aid program is earmarked for urban construction. Our Committee is concerned with rivers and harbors, with flood control, with water pollution, and with public works programs for areas suffering from economic distress, such as the Appalachia program and the accelerated public works program.

We are always looking toward the future, to see how the Federal programs which are under our responsibility may be developed for greater usefulness.

And so I invite your communications, as individuals and as an association, with the realization that the problems of our cities are National problems and a proper concern of the National legislature.

THE ELECTRIC CAR: AN ANSWER TO AIR POLLUTION

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill—H.R. 17702—which, if enacted into law, could result in a dramatic improvement in one of the Nation's most pressing problems—air pollution. My bill provides for a broad program of research into the feasibility of electrically powered vehicles of all types, and for the design and construction of prototype vehicles to demonstrate their potential in carrying the transportation burdens of the Nation.

Statistics of the U.S. Public Health Service prove the need for this effort. They show that 133 million tons of air pollutants are released into the air each year in the United States and the internal combustion engine accounts for 85 million tons of the total, almost two-thirds. If the problem is serious now, then consider this: It is projected that the number of automobiles in the Nation will more than double by 1980, and fuel consumption will keep pace.

The citizens of this Nation, and particularly of the State of New York, are well aware of the dangers to health caused by air pollution. Reports to the Congress by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare indicate that these threats to health require immediate attention.

With increasing frequency, we read of urban disasters resulting from air pollution. In London in 1952, more than 4,000 people died from a noxious fog that poisoned the air over the city. In 1962 more than 400 Londoners died in a similar occurrence.

New York has not been free of such disasters and I am informed some experts estimate that as many as 10,000 persons may die prematurely due to the effects of air pollution.

This is primarily an urban problem, but it is now also being felt in the suburbs, as well, as this excellent editorial from the Yonkers Herald Statesman for Tuesday, September 20, 1966, indicates:

TO LAUNDER THE AIR WE BREATHE

No Westchester housewife has to be told that there is an air pollution problem.

The evidence is before her day after day as she struggles to combat the dust and grime that make her housecleaning chores a never-ending labor.

What one never has exclaimed in desperation: "I just don't know where all the dirt comes from!"

It comes from the air all around us, spewed from incinerators, outmoded chimneys, assorted open air burnings and the ground debris picked up and scattered by the winds.

This "vast sewer," as Louis J. Battan of the University of Arizona calls it in his book, "The Unclean Sky: A Meteorologist Looks at Air Pollution," inundates us all.

And it is costing every one of us money, to say nothing of menacing our health.

The New York State Health Department, in a just issued report, estimates that the price of air pollution amounts to \$65 a year for every resident of the state.

Not only does air pollution cost us money out of pocket for house painting, car washing and increased laundering, it also is killing us, raising our chances of premature death by 20 per cent and swelling our outlays for medical care and medicines.

How cope with this problem? It is so extensive that Dr. Hollis S. Ingraham, state health commissioner, says Manhattan alone each year suffers from a rain of 40 million pounds of air contaminants large enough to be visible.

As far back as 1955 a federal research program was begun. And more and more interested agencies are becoming concerned as the evidence of pollution becomes more devastating. It will be the subject matter of a symposium at this week's national convention of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers in Atlantic City, for instance.

At the end of this month, the State Health Department will open hearings preliminary to promulgating new statewide rules in an effort to clean the air. The first will be in Albany next Monday, a second in New York City the following Wednesday. Let's hope that out of the testimony received we can at long last embark on a real program of research and control.

From an economic point of view, the cost of air pollution is devastating. I have been told that dirt, corrosion, and other damage from air pollution costs the Nation \$11 billion annually.

According to the Public Health Service, the internal combustion engine is the major contributor to this.

Studies on laboratory animals demonstrated that emphysema and other respiratory ailments are promoted by high concentrations of nitrogen dioxide. It has also been shown that nitrogen dioxide is concentrated most heavily in our large urban areas, and plays an important part in photochemical air pollution, causing lung irritation and vegetation damage.

Effects of the concentration of lead emissions from auto exhaust are currently the topic of much debate. Due to atmospheric conditions measurement is difficult and studies are currently underway to learn more about this, and about human tolerance to lead concentrations in the air.

Carbon monoxide has been shown to reduce the blood's oxygen-carrying capacity, cause headaches, dizziness, fatigue, nausea, and generally impair bodily functions, according to recent studies. The effects grow more serious as the concentrations of carbon monoxide increase.

Similarly, hydrocarbons have been shown to irritate the eyes, reduce visibility, damage vegetation, and produce photochemical smog.

Again, the automobile, with its internal combustion engine is the major cause.

Recently, a study reported by Dr. James McCarroll, of Cornell University's medical college in New York City, gave direct proof of the seriousness of automobile emissions. He reported:

Examination of total deaths in New York City by day of occurrence shows periodic peaks in mortality which are associated with periods of high air pollution.

Dr. McCarroll went on to say:

We have had an abundance of evidence that air pollution causes sickness and death in people suffering from respiratory disease and cardiac ailments. It is quite possible—

He added—

that some portion of the very considerable illnesses and symptoms borne by the average citizen may be in some way related to or aggravated by air pollution.

The study also revealed "an immediate rise in mortality occurring on the same day as the peaks of pollution" and "their frequent influence on death rates in the 45-to-64 age group, as well as those over 65."

The internal combustion engine, again, is the major contributor.

In recent years Congress has shown increasing concern with the growing threat to the health and welfare of our citizens as a result of automotive air pollution. Motor vehicle exhaust standards are now being applied. Which we hope will result in significant reductions in the emission of hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide for the next few years.

But this is simply not enough.

The fact is that the increase in the number of automobiles in the next few years will outstrip our efforts at control. Secretary of the Department of Health,

Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, made this very clear when he stated:

We estimate that before 1980 motor vehicles will be so numerous that the approaches to pollution control called for in the proposed standards . . . will no longer be adequate. This will pose an even more serious problem for the motor vehicle industry, and they should begin thinking about it now.

Obviously some alternative means of meeting our transportation needs must be developed—and quickly. In an age when we can power space vehicles by electric batteries—and reach for the very moon itself, in a situation where power, space, and weight are very factors of life and death—it is equally obvious that we can meet the challenge.

My bill to spur research and development for the electric car is designed to get government and industry thinking and working on a solution now.

The electrically powered vehicle can make a major contribution to air pollution control. This fact was recently recognized in a report by the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, of which Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE is chairman, where it was stated:

A variety of projects deserve more detailed scrutiny and study. Electrification of mass transit, use of battery-operated delivery vehicles and autos, and prospects for fuel cells to run individual passenger cars, all suggest research possibilities. The Federal Government should insure that research, development, and demonstration work in this area is carried on at maximum levels consistent with orderly progress.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, writing for a publication of the American Public Power Association, suggested:

We must develop a means of transportation which can give us the economy, comfort and flexibility in travel we are accustomed to, without adding a single molecule of carbon monoxide or other polluting substances to our already overburdened atmosphere.

I believe, along with Senator MAGNUSON, that electric vehicles can be developed, under a program of imaginative research, which are capable of serving the transportation needs of the Nation.

It is important to note that one major auto manufacturer, the Ford Motor Co., has already moved to take the lead in this effort. Less than a week after my bill was introduced, this firm announced a major research effort on the electric car. They deserve a great deal of credit for their foresight and I am happy to say that action on my bill will support and help to advance their program.

Many imaginative proposals have been offered recently which incorporate the use of electric vehicles. A Massachusetts company has developed a system of special small cars—called the Alden StarRcar system—which travel on regular roads or on a special automatic guideway. While on the guideway, these battery driven vehicles travel twice as fast as ordinary cars and offer a uniquely safe method of high-speed, mass transit.

Another interesting proposal is that of providing electric buses in our national parks to move large numbers of visitors in a smokeless, quiet manner within the park area.

These ideas, and the many others like them, deserve a complete investigation

under a broad program of research and development. The potential benefits to be derived from such a program are immeasurable. Electrically-powered vehicles are close to reality. It should be the policy of this Congress to insure that the opportunity for development is not lost, while air pollution hazards, urban congestion, noise, and environmental discomforts which result from combustion-powered vehicles increase.

My bill can bring this achievement closer.

WASHINGTON VISITORS BUREAU, WASHINGTON POST'S RICHARD L. COE, SUPPORT HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1027, PROPOSING SOUND AND LIGHT SPECTACLES TO ENHANCE THE BEAUTY OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 1027, which I introduced on April 4, 1966, would establish a commission to portray historic events at the Capitol by means of recorded sound tracks and an elaborate lighting system.

This sound and light technique, already a proven tourist attraction at European historic sites from England to Egypt, was discussed in the Washington Post of September 18, 1966, by Richard L. Coe.

The Washington Convention and Visitors Bureau has now joined Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the National Council on the Arts, Walter N. Tobriner, President of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, and Elizabeth Rowe, Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, in supporting this proposal. S. Dillon Ripley recently began experimenting with the sound and light technique at the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. Coe's article and the text of the August 22, 1966, resolution adopted by the Washington Convention and Visitors Bureau follow:

"LIGHT" AT ACROPOLIS RECALLS BILL HERE (By Richard L. Coe)

One of the most enthralling spectacles to be seen between Istanbul and Gibraltar, an area I recently skimmed, is the Sound and Light at the Acropolis in Athens.

Unlike many variations of painting history through visual and aural suggestions, this views the Acropolis from a distance of about half a mile. One sits on the neighboring, smaller Pnyx hill while hundreds of huge lights pulse on and off as voices describe the fabulous history of war and philosophy which haunts this hill of the Parthenon.

The effect is brooding and breathtaking and one may enjoy the lighting, except on nights of the full moon, from all parts of the sprawling city. Many find this Sound and Light to be the finest of the many which stretch from England to Egypt.

The experience was a reminder of the bill introduced last spring by Representative

HENRY S. REUSS (Democrat of Wisconsin) to create a Sound and Light production at the U.S. Capitol building.

This now has the support of Elizabeth Rowe, chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission; Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the National Council on the Arts, and Walter Tobriner, president of the District Board of Commissioners. Referred to the subcommittee on libraries and memorials, the bill is now being studied for "feasibility"—in other words, how can the project be financed and put into being?

Such is an entirely sensible question and Rep. REUSS doesn't look for any further action until the 90th Congress. It would seem, however, that one of the burgeoning foundations might be found to finance the substantial initial investment. (The Republic of France, by the way, made a gift of the Phillips equipment to the City of Athens.)

The advantages for the scheme are obvious. The Capitol building is the sole Washington edifice associated with every President since George Washington laid the cornerstone. Its panorama of American history is unique. The Board of Trade, also long on the record for the project, sees it as a superb tourist attraction and tourism is the city's second industry. (Quibble, if you like, as to whether the first is politics or statesmanship.)

Mrs. Johnson has shown interest in the plan, and, in a casual conversation, both President and Mrs. Kennedy remarked on how splendid Sound and Light might be at the Capitol Plaza.

There are precautions to be considered. The seating arrangements need not be made for thousands and need take only a limited area of space. The script, voices and music should be done by our finest artists. (The Athenian Sound and Light music, for instance, is sheer sound track corn.)

Sound and Light has had a curious American career. Its use on Philadelphia's Independence Hall several years ago proved oddly disappointing. A flat script, I thought, accounted for this. But it evidently has been immensely successful on the battleship North Carolina at Wilmington, N.C. The Smithsonian, last week, gave a suggestion of what might be done through a simplified version of light and sound it titled "Figures in a Landscape."

At all events, Rep. REUSS' bill holds promise of our own historic hill which might match, in quite different ways, the haunting spectacle on the Acropolis.

Sound and Light is not the only evening attraction at the Acropolis. At its feet are two theaters. The older is that of Dionysus, dating from the Golden Age but far less well preserved than its contemporaries at Epidaurus and Delphi. However, because of its antiquity and size, the Dionysus is infinitely the more impressive to muse upon although performances are never attempted here.

Almost nightly performances, however, are given further along the southern slope in the theater of Herod Atticus, that Roman of the second century A.D. who valued ancient Greece. This was once roofed with cedar, long since vanished, but it remains entirely usable for the annual Athens Festival, which stretches from early July to late September.

To sit on stone benches provided with wafer-thin pillows gives some notion of the hardness of those early theatergoers but the experience itself is unforgettable. At some angles it's possible to see the stage, the Parthenon and the gemlike temple of Wingless Victory.

The Athenian Festival performances are worthy of the setting. This year the Festival began with visits from England's Royal Ballet and the USSR's Kirov. It further offered national orchestras and operas from Switzerland, the USSR, Rumania, Spain and, only last week, the Utah Symphony. Pablo Casals conducted his "El Pessebre" and visiting in-

strumentalists included Ashkanazy, Istomin and Menuhin.

The theatrical classics are presented by the National Theater of Greece and the State Theater of Northern Greece. I was especially impressed by the former's "The Trojan Woman." A cursory knowledge of any of the plays is richly rewarded for the action and choral patterns are simple to follow. I was amused to find that the originals are not attempted, all being translated into modern Greek—a fact I don't understand either.

A final but modern hillside theater just behind Pnyx hill is the Philopappou, which presents dance troupes lured from all parts of Greece by enterprising Dora Stratou. These dancers are frankly amateurs and when one misses the flash of professionalism it's quite easy to look over to the Acropolis, virtually breathing in the rhythm of the Distant Sound and Light effects.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE WASHINGTON CONVENTION AND VISITORS BUREAU AUGUST 22, 1966, ENDORSING A PROGRAM OF SON ET LUMIERE (SOUND AND LIGHT) AT THE CAPITOL BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Whereas the Washington Convention and Visitors Bureau has long been in support of a Sound and Light Program for the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the Bureau members have personal knowledge of the effective employment of a Sound and Light presentation in many foreign countries and in some sections of the United States; and

Whereas by means of Sound and Light events of great historical importance can be portrayed in a beautiful and simple fashion; and

Whereas in the United States there is no one location better identified in the minds of Americans and foreigners alike than the Capitol of the United States; and

Whereas millions of visitors now coming to Washington, D.C., annually and many more who could come to witness a Sound and Light presentation would witness a visual and dramatic recitation of all the important events in this nation's history; and

Whereas a presentation of the history of this country through Sound and Light would be of tremendous benefit in the teaching of history to the millions of school students who visit Washington; and

Whereas the nation's greatest artists, performers and technicians would welcome the opportunity to be identified with a Sound and Light project having as its basis this country's rich history, successes and ideals; and

Whereas the beautiful, dignified and effective atmosphere of the United States Capitol would lend itself admirably to a Sound and Light program in addition to providing space for thousands of persons to witness this spectacle nightly; and

Whereas a presentation of Sound and Light would supplement the highly popular regular performances of the United States service bands; and

Whereas Congressman HENRY S. REUSS of Wisconsin has introduced House Joint Resolution 1027 to provide for Sound and Light evenings at the Capitol; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Executive Committee of the Washington Convention and Visitors Bureau strongly support H.J.R. 1027 as being in the best cultural, democratic and educational interests of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States Congress be urged to take action to implement H.J.R. 1027 by the necessary appropriation authority to bring Sound and Light into being at the Capitol; and be it further

Resolved, That Congressman REUSS be applauded and complimented for his efforts in this program and that he be encouraged to continue to pursue this project to its completion.

INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR TEACHERS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, some months ago the Internal Revenue Service of the U.S. Treasury Department published in the Federal Register proposed new regulations that would, in effect, curtail a deduction currently available to this country's most valuable but yet ironically our most unsung and ill-rewarded resource—our teachers. I refer, of course, the proposed Treasury regulation, scheduled to go into effect next January, which would no longer permit our teachers and educators from deducting from their Federal income tax those necessary expenditures incurred in course work or certain educational travel to improve their competency in their profession. In my State of Ohio there is now a critical and most serious shortage of teachers, due primarily to low pay and the lack of other proper incentives to help these worthy and vital people remain in their chosen vocation. This situation in my State has almost approached scandal proportions. I would be gravely remiss in my duties to all the citizens of my 11-county congressional district, if I did not stand up and fight any Federal move that could further exacerbate a most serious situation in my home State.

The bill I shall introduce today unfortunately will not solve the State of Ohio's major teacher shortage problem. This is a State administrative problem which our Governor and his aids will have to meet and solve. My bill, however, will assure the fact that the Federal Government does nothing to further a most difficult situation that we in Ohio find ourselves in. The bill by force of law will permit teachers to continue to deduct from their income taxes those expenses incurred in course work or certain educational travel vital to their improved professional competency. Enactment of this bill will have the effect of reinstating an Internal Revenue Service policy that from 1958 to the present time has permitted our poorly compensated teachers to make such deductions from their all-too-meager incomes. To me the curtailment of this deduction by our Treasury Department is totally unthinkable.

Our unsung and devoted teachers in every community in the country who use their hard-earned money to increase their knowledge and professional skill must be encouraged by all the means at our command rather than retarded in their professional growth. It is imperative that these most important citizens within our communities, who impart daily their talent and wisdom to our young, be given every opportunity to grow and flourish in their educational attainment. It would be the height of folly to do otherwise. Every incentive must be

found to keep these valuable people in their chosen field. It seems most incongruous to me that no similar proposal from the Treasury Department has been announced with regard to business deductions which I submit are permitted for far less important and significant expenses.

Can any Member of this great body justify in his own mind the deductions of the lobbyists for his expenses in plying his wares and at the same time deny similar privileges to those whose business is the education and training of our young—our future heritage? We in the great 89th Congress have done much for education at all levels across our great country, in fact we have been called the great education Congress; with this background we cannot, and I know we will not at this stage permit an agency of the Federal Government to take action inimicable to the interest of those to whom we owe so much and if this Nation is to continue its striving for excellence.

I trust that all Members of the House will rally behind my bill and that prompt action can be taken to assure its passage.

MAKE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS SAFER NOW

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Reader's Digest of September 1966 entitled "Make Our Neighborhood Roads Safer Now."

MAKE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS SAFER NOW

Whenever I return from a long automobile trip, the last dozen miles are a highway nightmare whose horrors are familiar to every American motorist. Turning off the magnificently engineered New York State Thruway, on which I've been cruising along at a safe and comfortable 60 to 65 m.p.h., I find myself on the old four-lane undivided highway that leads northward to my house. Suddenly my every reflex is taut. For the next 12 miles drivers dart at me in an undisciplined mess—from motels, bowling alleys, shopping centers, and from obscure side roads. Southbound cars pour past me in a stream less than four feet away. Last year a dozen people were killed on this road, and more than 100 were injured.

The contrast between the smooth safety of the Thruway and the jagged turbulence of the local road is deeply significant. For in the concept of the high-speed, controlled-access expressway, U.S. engineers have developed the safest roads ever made. Yet the roads on which we do 90 percent of our driving—to school, the supermarket, the neighborhood party—are the ones on which more than 90 percent of our automobile deaths occur, and they get more lethal every year.

What can we do about these everyday roads?

I have just spent six weeks talking with safety researchers of the Bureau of Public Roads, with highway patrolmen and traffic engineers across the country. The answer I

found is a surprising one: though many of the improvements needed are expensive and will take time, thousands of lives could be saved annually, and tens of thousands of injuries prevented, *quickly and at little cost.*

OLD FASHIONED HAZARDS

To see how this can be done, let's first get a closeup view of the problem. Take a tour with me on a typical sampling of old, bad roads, guided by Arthur Freed, the extremely competent traffic engineer for Westchester County, N.Y. Here are some of the things that Freed pointed out to me during a recent trip through the county's jungle of 42 city, town and village road jurisdictions.

"See that rotten old wooden guardrail?" he said as we drove along one of the county's older parkways. "It's worse than useless; it would collapse on impact and could impale the driver with splinters when the car hit it." Such rails abound in the United States. They were all right when they were installed, primarily as warning markers, in the days of 20-m.p.h. traffic, but today they're killers. One of the worst kinds is the wire cable stretched between posts and then allowed to go slack. The posts make excellent fixed-object collision points precisely where cars are most likely to hit them—on curves. And when they are run into by open-top sports cars, the cable can decapitate the occupants.

On a broad urban avenue Freed pointed out a directional sign. "It's placed illegally low," he said. "See how it obscures the intersection. Also, at that height, if you hit it from the side, it could come through your window like a guillotine. Besides, it's placed precisely where a skidding car will hit it."

In the course of a 10,000-mile road survey that he made for New York's Traffic Safety Council recently, Freed found that 72 percent of the nonstate-highway traffic signs are wrongly placed or badly designed, and he estimates that half of the mistakes are bad enough to cause serious accidents. "At 30 miles per hour you're going 44 feet a second, and a moment of indecision can turn into an accident mighty fast."

Going through a residential area, Freed said, "Notice that 'broken' center line. It indicates that you're safe to pass on this curve, even though we can't see 50 feet ahead." It's often suicide to rely on center-line passing instructions. These lines should be laid out by competent engineers, but it's usually the man running the paint truck who decides where they shall go. He frequently forgets that curves he can see around in early spring, when he paints the road, may be obscured by foliage in summer.

Conditions on local roads across the nation are just as hazard-laden. Recently two University of Michigan Medical School professors made a study of 177 automobile deaths in Washtenaw County, Mich. Their list of the accidents' causes included improperly designed guardrails, roadside embankments so designed that they flipped cars over, and drainage ditches that actually locked onto cars' wheels and steered them straight into trees. One fatal accident was caused by a tree that actually stuck out onto the road surface; the tree was still there three years later—and was finally cut down only because it was discovered to have Dutch elm disease.

Pennsylvania embarked on a program in 1961 to fix up the worst "accident clusters" in the state—the 1000-foot stretches of road where eight or more accidents had been reported in a three-year period. But when, with the aid of a computer, the list was drawn up, Pennsylvania found that—on the basis of state-police accident reports alone—it had 13,000 such clusters on 40,000 miles of state road. Highway officials haven't yet even had time to inspect them all.

MONEY, OR MONEY'S WORTH?

Is more money the answer to the problem? We already spend more local and state money on highways than on anything else but education. The job of reconstructing the roads that we've already built incorrectly would be so gargantuan as to make what we're now spending mere pennies. Even the present excellent "Spot Improvement Program" being pushed by the Bureau of Public Roads—with an estimated cost of \$1.25 billion over a five-year period to find and fix the most dangerous spots in each state—is just a drop in the bucket. It will fix, altogether, only about 6000 danger spots in all 50 states.

Then what is the answer?

This. *Let's get our money's worth for what we are already spending.* To understand what's involved, consider how ineptly we now run our roads.

There are 36,000 jurisdictions in charge of U.S. roads today, but only a tiny fraction employ people who really know their business. Take Freed's Westchester County. Of its 42 city, town and village road administrations, only two employ traffic engineers. In the county's biggest city, Yonkers (pop. 216,000), responsibility for all signs, markings and lights is in the hands of a policeman.

Or take Oklahoma's 77 counties. In each one the roads are split up among three elected county commissioners. They can have any kind of background and they may not even know how a bulldozer works, but each one is king of the roads in his district.

In Pennsylvania an official told me, "Turn off any state road in Pennsylvania and you run into the 19th century—the road domain of the township supervisor. He may be a farmer who tends roads between milking cows. 'Off-the-road hazards?' 'Traffic channelization?' He's never heard of them. He's a snowplow man, period."

At the state highway department level, it's often not much better. The chief traffic engineer of one of the biggest states told me, "I've got district engineers designing roads right now who ignore every safety lesson we've learned since World War II. They're supposed to submit their plans to me, but they don't. They've held their jobs many years, they've handed out millions of dollars in construction contracts, and they have friends in the state house."

Thus the incredible fact is that for much of your driving time your life is in the hands of people who don't know any more about road safety than you do.

How can we force people like this to give us our money's worth?

There are two ways:

1. PUBLIC PRESSURE

This can have considerable effect, because road jurisdictions are legally liable for damages caused by their mistakes. The village of Ossining, N.Y., for instance, had to raise its tax rate by 50 cents per thousand recently in order to pay a \$67,000 judgment for an accident caused by an improperly placed stop sign. Road authorities know that any proof that they were warned of a danger spot before an accident occurred may later serve as evidence against them in court. A letter to the local paper, a written protest to local authorities, to the state highway department, or even to the Bureau of Public Roads in Washington will eventually bring someone to investigate.

When you apply pressure, however, it's important to keep two things in mind. First, there may be good safety reasons for *not* making any changes. The most common example is the demand for traffic lights on arterial roads to facilitate local access. Highway officials know that such lights can often create more accidents of the rear-end type than they eliminate in the form of side collisions.

Second, be prepared for the stock response of the local road administrator: "With our present budget, we can only keep the roads in their present shape." It's true that basic structural improvements cost big money. But for every such case there are dozens of spots that can be made much safer at little cost.

On Route 274 in Pennsylvania, for instance, there were 11 accidents in two years on a curving hill near Mecks Corner. Just by doubling the size of the warning sign, road officials cut the rate to three accidents over the next two-year period. In Vacaville, Calif., there was a bad accident spot near a restaurant on the four-lane divided highway. Cars on the opposite side of the road from the restaurant would stop at a gap in the barrier to make a left turn across the opposing traffic—and would get hit from the rear as they waited to make the turn, or from the side as they crossed the road. Accidents were completely eliminated simply by closing the barrier gap and forcing cars to proceed to the next intersection, get off the road, turn around and come back.

The list of such inexpensive lifesavers is virtually endless. A "deslick" mix developed by the Virginia highway department—sharp sand particles mixed with asphalt—can dramatically reduce the skidiness of dangerous stretches. Steel sign supports—which get hit, and hurt motorists, surprisingly often—can be replaced by wooden "breakaway" posts notched a few inches above the ground so that they will safely give way on impact. Pennsylvania is now doing this with thousands of its signs, and recently researchers have perfected a similar "breakaway" design for steel posts. A few dollars phosphorescent paint can reduce accidents markedly at danger points like bridge abutments. Cutting down a "target tree" near the road can both eliminate a fixed-object hazard and increase the passing sight distance.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM

Public pressure on existing jurisdictions will correct some bad situations, but the best long-term solution is to get highway people who will "do it right the first time."

In 1947, for instance, California passed a law providing for a single road commissioner to be appointed for each county, and present law requires (with some exceptions) that each commissioner be a registered civil engineer. Today the state has one of the best-run road systems in the country. This mandatory approach can be effectively combined with a campaign to teach the present road administrators some basic safety lessons. The New York Traffic Safety Council has embarked on an ambitious program of statewide safety seminars, at which local officials are shown color slides of all the things they are doing wrong, and then given basic instruction in how to right them.

Another approach is to take the roads out of local hands, if necessary. In 1949 the Texas legislature, despairing of enforcing competence at the county level, allocated its state highway department \$15 million a year to rebuild county roads. Results: today, 37,000 miles of such road are run by extremely competent state highway engineers.

Which approach would be best for your area depends largely on the relative quality of your local and state governments. But no matter how we go about it, we've got to make our everyday roads safer. It's a job we can do, but up to now we've hardly even begun to do it.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to speak in favor of the passage of the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1967.

Yesterday this body passed legislation which appropriated funds for foreign aid, today we can take a step to assist our domestic program for flood control, navigation, develop our water resources, our navigational streams, help reclamation projects, provide outdoor recreation benefits, and projects for recreation and fish and wildlife facilities.

I am pleased to note that the bill carries an allocation of \$188,000 for the continuation of the study for the meadowlands of New Jersey, most of which lie within the boundaries of my congressional district.

In May of 1964, as mayor of East Rutherford, I appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the House and requested favorable consideration in the appropriation of funds for the meadowlands study. Last year, during my first year in Congress, this House allocated a sum of \$360,000 for such a study and now has, as I said before, made an allocation of \$188,000.

The funds thus allocated are for a study of flood control, major drainage, navigation, and land reclamation in the Hackensack River Basin, particularly the Jersey Meadows area; and the Passaic River, Raritan River, Arthur Kill, and Kill Van Kull, which comprise a total drainage area for these basins of 2,400 square miles within one of the largest and most densely developed urban centers in the United States. Tidal and river flooding occur frequently because of the lowland elevations. The highest recorded tide was 8.6 feet above mean sea level during Hurricane Donna in September 1960. However, studies indicate that under a condition of severe meteorological combinations a storm tide elevation of 15 feet above mean sea level is possible. Under these conditions the entire Jersey Meadows area would be inundated.

The meadows is a vast section of unused land which has lain dormant because of its swamplike character. Only about 10 percent of the area has been developed. The communities comprising the major portions of the meadows are: Jersey City, Kearney, North Bergen, Secaucus, Carlstadt, East Rutherford, Little Ferry, Lyndhurst, Moonachie, North Arlington, Ridgefield, Rutherford, and Teterboro.

The Arthur Kill and Kill Van Kull area is one of the most important industrial developments in the United States for storage, refining, and distribution of petroleum and allied products. The area also has large chemical plants; railroad, lumber, and coal terminals; public utility companies, and other industrial and chemical plants.

Newark Bay, with its multimillion-dollar waterfront developments at Port Newark and Port Elizabeth, provides in-

tegrated facilities for domestic and overseas movement of general cargo by water, rail, and truck.

The objective of this study is to formulate an overall plan for a balanced and coordinated development of the Newark Bay, Kill Van Kull, and Arthur Kill area, particularly the meadowlands, that would produce the maximum economic return from the area. Solution of the flood problem will consider upstream river control, the control of tidal action and major drainage. It is intended that the ultimate meadows plan give consideration to commercial, industrial, and residential uses, including consideration of related community and service facilities such as parks, roads, railroads, airports, waterways, water supply, sanitation, and pollution.

Several industries have already committed themselves to building their facilities on the reclaimed meadowlands and many others are potential customers for the East Rutherford meadowlands. The rapid reclamation of this swampland will add immeasurably to the tax potential of the area, once it is made available to interested users of this present eyesore.

When full reclamation of the meadowlands is accomplished, our community will be the beneficiary of a united effort between the Federal Government and local communities which have so much to gain by putting to work the land that is now useless and a detriment to the immediate surrounding areas.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the action taken by the Appropriations Committee in heeding my pleas which I made before the committee as the mayor of East Rutherford in 1964 and again as Congressman in 1965 and 1966.

It is anticipated that these studies will be completed during fiscal year 1967 and the necessary recommendations will be made at that time. I can assure this body that we, of the area involved in this study, will not hesitate to put into effect the recommendations made in this matter. We shall cooperate with any agency, department, or office to restore these meadowlands to a tax-producing state and encourage all interested parties to locate in these reclaimed lands to boost the economy of the communities which surround these present wastelands.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR TEACHERS TAKING COURSES

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLEVENGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which will allow teachers to deduct from their gross income, when computing Federal income tax, those expenses incurred in taking courses, or pursuing approved programs of educational travel, which will improve their professional competence.

This bill will correct a situation that has plagued the educators of this country for many years. Theoretically, under existing Internal Revenue regulations costs of educational courses taken by teachers have been deductible. In practice, however, the application of the IRS regulations have at best been whimsical, at worst been discriminatory, depending on the attitude of individual IRS agents. The taxpayer, of course, has recourse to the courts. But the amount of money involved hardly justifies the expense. Of the cases taken to court, the teachers involved have never lost a case. But thousands have been denied deductions and have been unable to finance the court costs involved.

The last straw in this situation occurred on July 7 of this year when IRS proposed new regulations which would be further restrictive against teachers. It seems clear that the action of Congress, in exercising its rightful authority to direct the Internal Revenue Service on tax policy, is essential if this matter is to be settled.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this an education bill in keeping with the objectives of Congress as evidenced by the enactment of far-reaching legislation, which I have always supported, to improve the quality of American education. The full impact of these education acts such as the Higher Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have not been realized, primarily because of the lack of enough skilled professional educators to implement new programs. Certainly it is necessary for teachers to be encouraged to continue their in-service training in order to meet the challenge of the ever-changing world which they face daily in the classrooms. Therefore, I urge that the Congress act this session to correct the abuses of the IRS and to prohibit them, by law, from continuing to harass our teachers.

SHIPPENSBURG STATE COLLEGE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the News-Chronicle, Shippensburg, Pa., on the growth of Shippensburg State College. The editorial recounts the progress the college has made in the past 10 years since Dr. Ralph E. Heiges became president.

I have visited the college a number of times and on each occasion was impressed.

I should also like to add my congratulations to the college and its president on an enviable and exemplary record.

I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

The growth of Shippensburg State College in the past ten years since Dr. Ralph E. Heiges became president is astounding and

a frequent topic of conversation in Shippensburg. But even more remarkable is the promise for the future as outlined by Dr. Heiges at the opening of this fall term.

Since Dr. Heiges became president in 1956, Shippensburg State has grown, not only in physical facilities and student body, but even more important, in its educational offerings to meet the needs of the area.

As Dr. Heiges points out, the curriculum in teacher education has been expanded to include a major in social science, certification in special education, a minor in speech and an entire new curriculum in library science.

Since 1959, when graduate courses were first offered, almost 3,000 students have participated in this program and six areas of concentration are now provided.

The arts and sciences program, established in 1962 with only a very few students, has almost 500 liberal arts students enrolled today.

The administrative staff in 1956 included the president, the dean of instruction, the director of student teaching and placement and the business manager. In the intervening ten years the dean of instruction has been named the dean of academic affairs and is now assisted by the dean of graduate studies, the dean of teacher education and the dean of arts and sciences, as well as by an assistant dean of academic affairs. Other new administrative posts include the administrative assistant to the president, the dean of student personnel, the director of admissions and his assistant, along with the dean of men and the dean of women. Still more recent appointments are the director of public relations, the director of alumni affairs, the director of development and the director of financial aid.

In the past ten years 157 new faculty positions have been created.

Throughout this period of rapid expansion in so many fields the college has maintained a high academic standing.

For this splendid achievement, Dr. Heiges credits the expectation of the administration and faculty as the "great motivating force for the student—both in activities and in academic achievement." With some pride he says, "... at the end of ten years the throbbing excitement of change and growth is felt in the institution. As we move into the next ten years, we see a continuation of the processes of change and expansion ..."

Referring to an observation of a speaker in a commencement address, "There are two ways to get to the top of an oak tree—climb it, or sit on an acorn." Dr. Heiges proposes to "climb it" even though, as you near the top, the branches get thinner, and at the same time more numerous and greater agility is required.

Looking into the future, Dr. Heiges sees increased specialization in both teacher education and the arts and sciences. He sees a business administration curriculum, a government administration curriculum, specialization in computer and data processing and in television. He predicts that the Master of Education degree will shortly be extended to mathematics, geography and library science; that with the advent of the planned science center offerings in this area will be augmented; that a Master of Arts degree will be added to the graduate program.

His look into the future finds that, to handle the growing student body and the proliferation of courses, lecture sections of 100 to 150 students will become prevalent; more and more use will be made of electronic equipment and other modern teaching devices, and graduate assistants will be instituted. The school day and the school year will also come in for changes. Evening classes for undergraduates are a distinct possibility and summer enrollments will inevitably increase.

Ten years ago Shippensburg enrolled 1,066 students. This year there are 2,900 full-time undergraduates. By 1970 a student body of 4,000 is projected and by 1975 this may be as high as 5,600, the president points out. Faculty numbers must increase proportionately.

Congratulations are due the college, and particularly to its farseeing president, on this great growth over the past ten years and on the splendid outlook for the future. But Shippensburg dare not forget that the community as well as the college must take account of this expansion in its plans for the future. While the college is responsible for its curriculum, its faculty and administrators, its student body, the community must meet the needs of the college for water and sewer. While the college will pay its share of the costs, the continuing increase in needs for such services must enter into the "ten year development charts" of Shippensburg as well as into the college's own charts.

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, as a forthright expression of journalistic opinion on a matter presently under consideration by the Congress, I should like to call attention to an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Martinsburg Journal.

Martinsburg is a small city located in the eastern panhandle of my home State and district. It has the traditions of nearly two centuries of corporate existence behind it, and yet it is as modern as tomorrow. It is the county seat of Berkeley County, a rich agricultural community noted for its fine fruit among other farm products. In addition to being the commercial and financial center of this area, it has built up varied and prosperous industries. It is a beautiful city, a cultured city, a wonderful place in which to live.

The Martinsburg Journal is a newspaper in keeping with the character of the community. In appearance and in coverage of the news of the day, it would be a credit to a city many times the size of Martinsburg. Its presentation of political and government activity is alert and, in general, well informed.

The editorial to which I refer is an example of the Journal's habit of speaking out clearly on matters which it considers to be in the public interest. From the editorial itself, it may be inferred that the Journal is not without strong political leanings. It is not necessary to be in agreement with its political bent to approve the practice of frank expression.

In earlier days, the newspapers of this country filled a recognized role as organs of political opinion. This encouraged public discussion. So long as the newspaper reporting was fair and complete, it intensified public comprehension of the issues of the day. It is a result very much to be desired.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress appointed to make the study and draw up the report has as one of its members my distinguished and able colleague from West Virginia, KEN HECHLER. The committee deserves full credit for its thorough and conscientious work. And I am confident that any legislation growing out of the committee's report will get a distinct boost from the Journal's editorial. I include the editorial as a part of the RECORD:

CONGRESS REFORM PROPOSALS

It may be that, as the six Republican members complain, recommendations for an overhaul of congressional procedure just submitted by a 12-man bi-partisan committee don't go far enough. But we have a notion that the report goes farther than Congress will be willing to.

The major recommendations, as outlined in press dispatches, strike this newspaper as excellent. They include:

Opening of committee hearings to the press and public—save in cases where the national security is involved or where the nature of the testimony may reflect adversely on the character of witnesses or others—and at the option of the chairman to TV and radio.

A five-day work week for Congress, thus ending the present practice of limiting most business to Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays.

Creation of select committees in the two branches to police the conduct of members and employees.

More stringent control of the activities of lobbyists.

Giving the majority of a Congressional committee the authority to call a meeting and act on legislation if the chairman refuses to.

Divesting members of Congress of the patronage tidbit of appointing postmasters and recommending rural mail carriers.

Creation of a joint committee to carry on a continuing study of the organization and operation of Congress.

Adoption of these recommendations would tend to improve both the character and the performance of Congress. Because they would tread on some sensitive political toes, however, it is to be very seriously doubted that the law makers will agree to some of them. If it turns out otherwise the committee will be due a public vote of thanks for an excellent job and the Congress as a whole a vote of confidence for acceptance of the reforms.

PARTISAN USE OF KENNEDY FILM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I addressed the House on the matter of the partisan showing of the John F. Kennedy film in Dallas, Tex. I called on the administration to take firm action to halt such partisan use of the Kennedy film, which was made to be shown to overseas audiences.

I understand that the Greater Dallas Democratic Club president, Myron Hauser, has changed his mind about where the profits from the exhibition will go. Yesterday forenoon he said the profits would be divided 50-50 between the club and the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington. Now he has stated that profits will go to a char-

ity. I hope it will be to the Kennedy Center. He did not specifically designate the Kennedy Center, however, since he claimed the board of trustees will have to designate the charity.

Mr. Hauser has changed his position considerably since he told the Dallas Morning News on September 12, 1966, that "funds we raise by showing the movie will go to support all Democratic candidates here and a portion of the funds will go to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts."

I would like to insert here a story from the Washington Post for September 21, 1966:

HOUSE REPUBLICAN HITS PARTISAN SHOWINGS—DALLAS DEMOCRATS AGREE NOT TO USE KENNEDY FILM AS PARTY FUND-RAISER

(By Andrew J. Glass)

Dallas Democrats agreed under pressure yesterday not to use a Government-produced film about John F. Kennedy for Party fund-raising in the city of his assassination.

The feature-length film, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," will still be shown Thursday evening at a \$5-a-seat gala in Dallas. But its Democratic sponsors promised that all the proceeds will go to a charity, probably the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington.

The latest flap over the Kennedy movie erupted as Representative ALBERT H. QUITE, Republican, of Minnesota, demanded in a House speech that the Johnson Administration move to halt partisan showings, such as the one planned by the Greater Dallas Democratic Club.

QUITE reported that he had informed the Justice Department about the Dallas affair but complained that the U.S. lawyers were not "being aggressive enough."

"Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" is scheduled to be shown in 91 theaters across the country before the November elections. Last year, Congress passed a law permitting commercial domestic screenings of the movie, originally produced by the United States Information Agency for overseas distribution. (It opens in Washington tonight.)

USIA sold the film to the Kennedy Center for \$120,000, which in turn licensed Joseph L. Levine's Embassy Pictures Corp. to distribute the film for a \$150,000 advance and promotion guarantees totaling another \$300,000.

In clearing the picture for general U.S. distribution, a House report asserted that "the film ought not to be used . . . for partisan political fund raising."

On Sept. 12, the Dallas Morning News quoted Myron Hauser, chairman of the Dallas Democratic club, as saying "the funds we raise by showing the movie will go to support all Democratic candidates here and a portion of the funds will go to the Kennedy Center."

Hauser told a QUITE aide yesterday morning that the funds would be split 50-50—whereupon the Republican lawmaker prepared a speech denouncing use of the movie as a "political tool."

This triggered a fast flurry of telephone calls and telegrams between Dallas and Washington. By late afternoon, Hauser had sent a telegram to Ralph Becker, general counsel of the Kennedy Center and a Republican, pledging that "the net proceeds for the engagement will be used for charitable purposes and not otherwise."

Becker felt the Dallas showing, as originally planned, not only violated Congressional intent but also was "in poor taste." Mr. Kennedy was slain in Dallas on Nov. 22, 1963.

Three screenings of the Kennedy film were recently canceled by the Kennedy Center

when it was revealed that money raised at the performances would have gone to Democratic candidates. Benefits were called off in Des Moines and Waterloo, Iowa, for Senatorial candidate E. B. Smith and in Milwaukee for John Buckley, a Democratic contender for Congress.

A film-based political fund-raising venture is still scheduled by Democrats in Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, near Akron, on Sept. 28. If the Democratic county chairman there refuses further pleas to drop the partisan showing, the contract will be canceled, Becker said.

I am pleased that profits from the Dallas screening will apparently not be used for partisan purposes, that is, for the campaign chests of Democratic candidates. Yet, it seems to me, the question should never have come up.

The distributor of the film, Embassy Pictures, although belatedly, made its position clear in the following letter and telegram:

[Release prearranged book No. 2]

EMBASSY PICTURES CORP.,

September 1, 1966.

When discussing "Years of Lightning" with exhibitors it is imperative that you tell them that they cannot make sales to any political groups or any politically-oriented groups during their engagement of "Years of Lightning". Please call all exhibitors today for all dates you now have and give them this information and further tell them if they now have arrangements with such groups they are to be cancelled.

D. J. EDELE.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1966.

MANAGER,
Strand Theatre
York, Pa.

DEAR SIR: It is very important that you do not make arrangements for a group showing with any political or politically oriented group during your engagement of "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

I cannot stress too much, the importance of this matter.

Many thanks for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

EDDIE SOLOMON.

As you can see, no arrangement with any organization with a name and membership like the Dallas Democratic Club should have been made.

I now bring to the attention of the House another instance where the film is being used in violation of the intent of Congress.

The Summit County Democratic organization in Ohio has purchased all the tickets for the September 28, 1966, showing of the film at the Cuyahoga Falls State Theater. The chairman of the executive committee of the Democratic organization, Mr. Robert Blakemore, has been questioned by Mr. William Vance, political writer for the Akron Beacon Journal about the propriety of using the film to raise money for a political organization. Despite this, as of last evening, the Democrats plan to go ahead with the showing.

They hope to make some \$5,000 from the 8:30 p.m. showing. They pay the theater \$1.50 for each ticket and are in turn selling them for \$5 each. This would net the Democratic organization about \$5,000, since the theater holds about 1,600 people at one time.

According to Mr. Vance, this is the main fundraising effort of the Summit County Democratic organization.

Apparently, the Kennedy Center will profit somewhat from the showing, in that it is supposed to get part of the \$1.50-a-ticket price, anywhere from 10 to 30 percent of the \$1.50, from what I have been able to learn.

But by far, the largest profit will accrue to the Democrat organization.

There is no question that the showing of the Kennedy film on September 28 in Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, is in violation of the intent of Congress when it released the film for U.S. distribution.

This is now the fourth such case that has been brought to the attention of Congress.

Yesterday, I called for the administration to take firm action to halt such partisan showings. I repeat that request today. The American people must be assured that all future showings of the Kennedy film will be nonpartisan in nature.

UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to establish a uniform policy for the treatment of those forced to relocate because of Federal and federally aided public improvement programs.

This legislation passed the Senate on July 22, 1966. It should receive early consideration by the House. If it is not acted on this year, it should be one of the first items considered by the 90th Congress in January.

As the Senate Committee on Government Operations has reported:

The governmental displacement of persons and businesses is substantial at present, and all indications are that the rate of displacement will continue to grow.

The adverse effects of relocation hit most severely those families and individuals least able to withstand them in terms of income and the ability to find other housing.

Small businesses, particularly those owned and operated by the elderly, are major victims of the relocation process.

To compound these difficulties, present Federal provisions for relocation assistance are widely inconsistent and lacking in equity. They are also, in many cases, inadequate.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, would not only provide a uniform relocation assistance policy for all Federal and federally assisted programs, it would make badly needed improvements in the scope and amount of relocation benefits as well.

In respect to mass transit programs, for example, the present maximum relocation payment is \$200 for an individual or a family. This legislation would allow a \$200 moving cost, a dislocation allowance up to \$100, \$300 if the displaced person purchases a residence within a year, and an additional sum for closing

costs. As an alternative, an individual or a family may elect to receive an administratively determined "fair and reasonable" sum.

In the case of businesses, the present limit authorized for terminated firms by the mass transit legislation is \$3,000. This bill would give the businessman a choice of, first, reimbursement equal to the cost of moving personal property, or second, a sum equal to his average annual net earnings or \$5,000, whichever is less. In addition, Federal reimbursement for authorized relocation expenses could go to \$25,000, with Federal-State cost sharing above that amount.

The experience of numerous individuals, families and small businesses in my district indicates that these extensions are both needed and warranted.

Mr. Speaker, I am including an analysis, prepared at my request by the Library of Congress, which discusses these and other aspects of this uniform relocation assistance legislation. I hope that all Members will take a few minutes to read and consider it.

For the fact is that relocation is a serious and growing problem across the United States. The prospects are that displacement will increase in the years ahead. Let us act, then, to insure that equity and consistency characterize our relocation programs. And let us be sure that they are adequate for the need they are to bear.

THE UNIFORM RELOCATION ACT OF 1966 (S. 1681) SUMMARY, AS PASSED BY THE SENATE JULY 22, 1966, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ITS EFFECT ON THE MASS TRANSIT PROGRAM (By Elizabeth M. Heidebreder, Analyst in Area Economics and Transportation, Economics Division, September 1, 1966)

I. BACKGROUND

As currently administered, there is no uniform policy regarding relocation payments and assistance to owners, tenants, and other persons displaced by the acquisition of real property in Federal and Federally assisted programs. The General Services Administration and the Post Office Department, for example, do not provide any relocation payments or assistance to persons affected by their programs. Programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (Urban renewal, public housing, and mass transportation) pay substantially more than the highway programs administered by the Bureau of Public Roads under the multi-million dollar highway programs, relocation payments are optional with the States and only 32 States have elected to make payments. Of these, only 22 provide payments up to the level authorized under the highway program, and this level is below the HUD programs. Furthermore, the Federal highway programs provide very little advisory assistance for those displaced by highway projects.

These inconsistencies and injustices are thus substantial and call for legislative action to correct them. S. 1681, the Uniform Relocation Act of 1966, is a legislative attempt to deal with this problem.

The Senate Committee on Government Operations report on S. 1681 was particularly concerned with the inconsistencies of relocation policy. In addition, it listed certain other reasons for the legislation as follows:

1. The governmental displacement of persons and businesses is substantial at present, and all indications are that the rate of

displacement will continue to grow. Displacements in the immediate past totaled 85,550 per year, while such displacements in the future will amount to an estimated 132,600 per year.

2. The adverse effects of relocation hit most severely those families and individuals least able to withstand them in terms of income and the ability to find other housing. The elderly, the large family, and nonwhite displacees are particularly affected.

3. Small businesses, particularly those owned and operated by the elderly, are major victims of the relocation process. The Small Business Administration has estimated that by 1972 about 120,000 businesses will have been displaced by urban renewal, and that at the present rate, 3 out of 10 of these firms will be liquidated.

4. Of growing importance in the relocation process is adequate provision for advisory assistance. For the poor, the nonwhite, the elderly, and many small business people, relocation payments are not enough to assure their making an adequate adjustment to a forced move.

5. Present Federal relocation provisions are not only inconsistent and inequitable, but their administration, particularly in the case of business relocation, is too cumbersome. Current requirements for detailed documentation are costly for the public and for the displaced person. Congress has already authorized fixed relocation payments for displaced families or individuals in certain programs. Yet administrative agency practices do not always give the displacee the opportunity to decide whether to accept the fixed payment or to prove his actual cost.

All of these findings, which were based upon extensive studies, supported the need for new legislation. The Senate Committee on Government Operations reported S. 1681 (with amendments) on July 20, 1966, and it was passed by the Senate on July 22nd.

II. PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

The Uniform Relocation Act of 1966 has three main sections dealing with (A) Federal Programs; (B) Federally Assisted Programs; and (C) Land Acquisition Policy.

A. Federal programs

The first section deals with programs of real property acquisition which are funded entirely by the Federal Government. This would include programs of the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, the Post Office Department, and others. Section A also gives the President responsibility for establishing relocation regulations to achieve government-wide uniformity and compliance.

In Federal programs, independent businesses and displaced persons may elect either to receive "fair and reasonable" relocation payments as administratively determined according to the uniform regulations or to accept fixed relocation payments. The amounts of the "fair and reasonable" relocation payment is not set, but the President is to be guided by the fact that \$25,000 is set as the upper limit for the 100 percent Federal share of relocation payments in Federally assisted programs.

Displaced persons who elect to accept fixed payments will receive (1) a moving expense allowance up to \$200; (2) a dislocation allowance not greater than the moving expense allowance or \$100, whichever is the lesser; and (3) an additional payment of \$300 if the displaced person purchases a residence within 1 year from the date of actual displacement; (4) an additional payment for certain reasonable and necessary expenses incurred as a result of the conveyance of his real property to the acquiring Federal agency. The wide variation in these

closing costs make it impossible to establish a fixed payment.

A displaced farm operator has the option of accepting a fixed payment of \$1,000 in lieu of reimbursement for his fair and reasonable expenses. This provision is designated primarily to assist the small farm operator.

In addition to the other payments, low-income displaced families, elderly individuals, or handicapped persons for whom public housing units are not available are entitled to monthly payments of not to exceed \$1,000 over two years. Not more than \$500 in the first 12 months and \$500 in the second 12 months shall be available for relocation in "decent, safe, and sanitary housing" of modest standards.

In addition to the relocation payments, Federal agencies are to provide relocation services to displacees and to other persons occupying property adjacent to the real property acquired who have suffered substantial economic injury as a result of the Federal action. These services shall include the assurance that there will be available to displaced homeowners and tenants "decent, safe, and sanitary" housing at prices within their financial means and in areas reasonably accessible to their places of employment. Owners of displaced businesses and displaced farm operators are also to be assisted in reestablishing themselves in suitable locations. Other governmental programs are to be used to minimize hardships to displacees and to assure coordination of relocation activities.

The Housing Act of 1961 authorized the Small Business Administration to make loans on favorable terms to displaced business concerns suffering substantial economic injury. The Uniform Relocation Act (section 4d) extends this assistance to any small business concern adversely affected even though not actually displaced.

Another provision of Part A makes it clear that the same requirements for relocation payments and assistance programs shall apply when a State agency acquires real property for a Federal public improvement project.

B. Federally assisted programs

This part requires that State and local government agencies administering Federally assisted development programs provide certain relocation payments, services, and housing assurances as a condition of payment of Federal funds. These are to follow the stipulations in part A with the added provision that 100 percent Federal reimbursement may be made up to \$25,000 for any displaced person. Above \$25,000, Federal agencies will contribute to the additional cost according to the project's cost-sharing formula.

C. Land acquisition policy

Although the subject of land acquisition policies was considered by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, it was decided that most of the issues were too complicated to deal with along with relocation policies. Only some relatively minor provisions were incorporated into S. 1681 as part C, section 10. Section 10 is similar to section 402 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 which deals with land acquisition policies administered under Department of Housing and Urban Development programs. These provisions are now applied to all Federal and Federally assisted programs. In the case of Federal development programs, section 10 calls for negotiated purchase of property whenever possible and a 90-day notice before owners and tenants must surrender property. In the case of Federally assisted programs, it requires that both of the above policies shall apply and also requires, in cases where agreement on prices has not been reached, immediate

payment of 75 percent of the appraisal value of the property to the owner, with the balance deposited with the court.

III. EFFECT OF S. 1681 ON MASS TRANSIT RELOCATION PROGRAM

Section C concerning land acquisition policy already applies to the mass transit program. This was affected through the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. The other provisions concerning relocation payments and assistance would, however, liberalize relocation provisions of the mass transit act.

Presently the maximum relocation payments in the transit program are \$200 (principally moving costs) for an individual or family. The new legislation would allow a \$200 moving cost; a dislocation allowance up to \$100; an additional \$300 if the displaced person purchases a residence within a year; and an additional sum for closing costs. Also, an individual or family may elect to receive an administratively determined "fair and reasonable" sum rather than the relatively fixed sums just mentioned.

As to relocation assistance, the mass transit act requires an adequate relocation program and the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families only; individuals are not covered. Under S. 1681, individuals would also be covered and relocation services would be increased.

In the case of businesses, the \$3,000 maximum authorized for terminated firms by the mass transit legislation would be changed by S. 1681. The businessman would have the choice of (1) reimbursement equal to the cost of moving personal property, or (2) a sum equal to his average annual net earnings or \$5,000, whichever is less.

If a displaced business reestablishes, under the mass transit act a maximum of \$3,000 is placed on the amount payable for loss of property, or moving expenses and loss of property combined. However, a firm may receive up to \$25,000 for certified moving expenses only. No relocation assistance is provided. Under S. 1681, Federal reimbursement for authorized relocation expenses (to be administratively determined) could go to \$25,000. Above \$25,000, there would be Federal-State cost sharing according to the formula of mass transit programs (two-thirds Federal, one-third State). Relocation services would be extended not only to displaced businesses, but to businesses which have suffered economic injury as a result of the transit project. The Small Business Administration is also authorized to make loans on favorable terms to both displaced and economically injured businesses.

Thus, it can be seen that the relocation provisions of the Urban Mass Transportation Act would be substantially extended if S. 1681 were to become law. Up to now, there has not been any substantial construction of mass transit facilities with Federal aid which required relocation payments and assistance. However, San Francisco's new 75-mile rapid transit system will probably cause some dislocation of individuals and businesses, and it is receiving Federal aid. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has just announced approval of a \$13,100,000 capital grant to the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District which included \$328,000 in relocation funds. As of now, these funds would be administered under the relocation provisions of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

COMMENDATION TO OAS PEACE FORCE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ala-

bama [Mr. SELDEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, a year ago our news media were crammed with reports about the outbreak of civil strife in the Dominican Republic. President Johnson's timely dispatch of troops to that troubled land evoked much debate.

Unfortunately, international success stories seldom attract the attention devoted to fearful events. I would like to call to your attention a little publicized but enormously significant, episode relative to the Dominican situation.

Today the last troops of the Inter-American Peace Force withdrew from the Dominican Republic. Their departure marks the conclusion of one of the most heartening and successful ventures in international peace-keeping.

Time and the rush of new crises make us forget the dimensions of the problem the hemisphere faced a year ago in Santo Domingo. Then, that troubled country threatened to erupt into a savage battlefield. The result would have been scores of innocent people slaughtered, the economy wrecked, the governmental structure disintegrated. At the same time, the Communists were actively promoting their own designs on the chaotic situation.

There are those who argue that the Dominicans should have been permitted to settle their enmities by a bloodbath, come what may. I strongly dissent.

Had the civil war continued, it would have engendered new fiery hatreds with which Dominicans would later have had to contend. Had the civil strife continued, the ravage to that country would have imposed a severe burden upon future generations. Had the battle continued, the possibility of a Communist seizure of power could not be ruled out. In short, I am unable to understand the contention that the Dominican people, and democracy, would have been served by continued battle.

President Johnson's decision to act gained time for the inter-American regional system to seize the initiative. In arranging a cease-fire, in working out a political settlement between the two contending camps, in helping the Provisional Government get the economy moving again, in cooperating in arrangements for a free election last June, the OAS performed an incalculable service for the entire hemisphere.

Throughout the tense period of reconstruction, the presence of the Inter-American Peace Force became a significant factor in enabling the OAS to pursue a peaceful solution for the Dominican people. Men of six nations, speaking three languages, conducted a remarkably smooth operation in a delicate situation. As they return to their homelands, these troops deserve our commendation and gratitude for a sensitive job well done.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legisla-

tive program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WATKINS) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUINN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. KUPFERMAN, for 60 minutes, on Wednesday, September 28.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. WALDIE), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SELDEN (at the request of Mr. WALDIE), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. WALDIE), for 60 minutes, on September 28, 1966; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. WHITTEN to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee today.

Mr. NEDZI (at the request of Mr. HEBERT) was given permission to insert a letter from Secretary Morris in his statements during the Committee of the Whole.

At the request of Mr. WATKINS, all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in connection with Mr. CURTIS' special order of today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WATKINS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. COLLIER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WALDIE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COOLEY.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3553. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Brooks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 146. An act for the relief of Delma S. Pozas;

S. 153. An act for the relief of Matsusuke Tengan;

S. 372. An act for the relief of Antonio Jesus Senra (Rodriguez) and his wife, Mercedes M. Miranda de Senra;

S. 766. An act for the relief of Lt. Samuel R. Rondberg, U.S. Army Reserve;

S. 993. An act for the relief of Dr. Oscar Valdez Cruz;

S. 1120. An act for the relief of Dr. Ortelio Rodriguez Perez;
 S. 1571. An act for the relief of Kermit Wager, of Lebanon, S. Dak.;
 S. 2177. An act for the relief of Donald I. Abbott;
 S. 2265. An act for the relief of Konstadyna Byni Delloglou and her minor child, Alexandros Delloglou;
 S. 2287. An act to authorize a 5-year hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula;
 S. 2348. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge G. Echenique;
 S. 2376. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario Presman;
 S. 2447. An act for the relief of Dr. Arturo Victor Fajardo-Carpio;
 S. 2529. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix Hurtado Perez;
 S. 2555. An act for the relief of Kim Kin Soon;
 S. 2626. An act for the relief of Dr. Argrios A. Tsifutis;
 S. 2789. An act for the relief of Dr. Alberto Oteiza;
 S. 2796. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Anrrich;
 S. 2800. An act for the relief of George Joseph Suad;
 S. 2838. An act for the relief of Irene Snyder;
 S. 2865. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Hernandez;
 S. 2869. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Enrique Diaz;
 S. 2945. An act for the relief of Dr. Jaime E. Condom Valera;
 S. 2973. An act to permit Edward C. Bower to serve as a director of the Virgin Islands National Bank prior to his obtaining U.S. citizenship;
 S. 3189. An act for the relief of Dr. Alonso Portuondo; and
 S. 3272. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacobo Albo Maya.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 22, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2738. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the statistical supplement, stockpile report to the Congress, for the period ending June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 79-520; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2739. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting a report of review of the policy of leasing motor vehicles for use by Government contractors, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2740. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Treasury Department, transmitting a certified copy of amendments to the regulations governing the standards for numbering of undocumented vessels, pursuant to the provisions of 46 United States Code 527d; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2741. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Wel-

fare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payments to Federal providers of services for services furnished to individuals entitled to benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2742. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements of Columbia River Federal power system, fiscal year 1965, Departments of the Army and the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report on Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1966 (National Zoological Park) (Rept. No. 2048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operation. Report on Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1966 (National Capitol Regional Planning Council) (Rept. No. 2049). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 17083. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2050). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. KELLY: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report entitled "The Crisis in NATO" (Rept. No. 2051). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2463. An act to grant the consent of the Congress to the acceptance of certain gifts and decorations from foreign governments, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2052). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 14249. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments (Rept. No. 2062). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 3467. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children (Rept. No. 2063). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 14088. An act to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an improved health benefits program for retired members and members of the uniformed services and their dependents, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2064). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6226. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido Benach Carreras; with amendment (Rept. No. 2053). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6658. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hilda Wenceslao Perez de Gonzalez (Rept. No. 2054). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6899. A bill for the relief of Dr. Myriam de la Caridad Ares y Fernandez de Bosch; with amendment (Rept. No. 2055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10259. A bill for the relief of Dr. Allan Bauman (Rept. No. 2056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11224. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pedro Raphael (Rept. No. 2057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11590. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacinta Llorens (Rept. No. 2058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12317. A bill for the relief of Dr. Augusto J. Fernandez Conde; with amendment (Rept. No. 2059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13101. A bill for the relief of Mario P. Navarro, doctor of medicine (Rept. No. 2060). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 16610. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio Rondon Delgado; with amendment (Rept. No. 2061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BANDSTRA:

H.R. 17872. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 17873. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 17874. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 17875. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 17876. A bill to provide uniform, fair, and equitable treatment of persons, businesses, or farms displaced by Federal and

federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 17877. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 17878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 17879. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 17880. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 17881. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17882. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to extend the programs of health insurance for the aged under title XVIII of such act to include items and services provided in foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 17883. A bill to provide training opportunities for persons employed in the legislative branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 17884. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Biscayne National Monument in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 17885. A bill to establish a National Council for the Handicapped, and to declare a national policy for the adjustment, education, rehabilitation, and employment of the handicapped, with emphasis upon development of the handicapped in a manner calculated to enable them to take their rightful place in society, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 17886. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 17887. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase to \$25,000 the amount of servicemen's group life insurance which may be carried by members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 17888. A bill to amend the joint resolution of January 25, 1923, to require Members of the House of Representatives and

their employees to make certain certifications with respect to expenditures made from clerk hire funds for compensation of employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLEVINGER:

H.R. 17889. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 17890. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 17891. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 17892. A bill to increase the membership of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 17893. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the rates of financial assistance under the veterans' educational assistance program of that title and to broaden that program to provide for assistance in on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 17894. A bill to prohibit the payment of compensation to a spouse or child of a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives employed in certain positions; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 17895. A bill to impose certain safeguards on investigations carried out by Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 17896. A bill to eliminate the test of financial need as a prerequisite for the sale of feed for livestock in emergency areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 17897. A bill to provide additional drought disaster relief by reimbursement of one-half the cost of shipment of hay; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 17898. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 17899. A bill to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, to increase the maximum amount of insured accounts or deposits to \$15,000 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 17900. A bill to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 17901. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 17902. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act to increase the amount of insurance applicable to bank deposits and savings and loan accounts to \$20,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 1305. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week in October of each year as National Water Awareness Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 1306. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the 7-day period beginning October 2 and ending October 8 of each year as Spring Garden Planting Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLORY:

H.J. Res. 1307. Joint resolution authorizing participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 17903. A bill for the relief of Vilis Lapieniks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 17904. A bill for the relief of Lamia Julian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 17905. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Isabella Lieben Caldwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 17906. A bill for the relief of Elias S. Mouroukas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 17907. A bill for the relief of Theofane Spiros Koukos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 17908. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laureana Bernardina Cal de Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 17909. A bill for the relief of Angela Liotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 17910. A bill for the relief of Young Kill Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1966

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK, a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, we are aware of the availability of your presence as we assemble here in the U.S. Senate. We know that you will not force yourself upon this body of leaders, but you will be the supporting spiritual help in their debate and decision as they give